

BOSTON REVIEW.

VOL. III.—MAY, 1863.—No. 15.

ARTICLE I.

ATONEMENT.—STEPS DOWNWARD.

OF error in regard to the Atonement it may be truly said, as of sin, "when it hath conceived it bringeth forth death." All sin, even the least, has in it active, germinal, fatal poison. So with mistake in relation to this central, vital doctrine of grace. By a slight change of the acorn in your hand you may easily destroy the mighty oak.

So by taking away what seems to be a very little of the Atonement the whole system may be corrupted. And, in these days of studied perversion of doctrines, and of the opening afresh the Imprecatory Psalms, if the apostle were here, he might be moved again to address the Church, "I marvel that ye are so soon (*οὐτω ταχέως*, so readily) removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ, unto another gospel; which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."

In the January number we attempted to state clearly, and establish, the true Scriptural view of the Atonement; meeting also the common objections which are charged against it. We now undertake to mark some of the steps in the scale, or, rather, different scales, downward from it towards acknowledged infidelity.

Before proceeding directly to mark the several processes which contain the uniform, initiatory steps downward, some preliminary views should be given of them as a whole, by way of accounting for them, and of showing how natural and easy it is for man, as he is, to take them.

By the gravitation of apostate nature, it is easier to descend than to ascend ; and, in either direction, great changes are rarely made at a bound. They are, especially at their beginnings, either by slight, often unconscious inclinations, or by easy steps, wrought by skilful engineers, or worn by the foot-steps of preceding travellers. If any ask why steps should be taken down from so fundamental and divine a doctrine, we might answer by asking, why should steps be taken downward from the high ground of Inspiration ? The same cause operates in both. They are the hinges which connect the human with the divine. While the connection is palpable and essential, there must of necessity be many things which belong to the infinite, and which man can neither reach up to, nor pry into. It is natural for the human reason to seek some theory which shall remove these difficulties.

Some attempt boldly to sweep away all that is supernatural, and of course what remains may be a simple system. But in it God is dethroned, and henceforth it is nothing above, nor better than, Platonism. Others are willing to allow the supernatural partially to remain, and seek to soften down the difficulties to meet the demands of human reason. In the case of Inspiration, the account of the creation is regarded in the light of an allegory ; the book of Jonah is severely questioned ; old manuscripts which omit certain passages of the gospels and epistles are hunted up ; a corresponding theory must be invented, such as, that God has given us a revelation, but no special record of it ; and man is left to his reason, his cravings, and experiences, to pick out of the Scriptures the divine revelation. This theory once admitted, of course all is easy and beautiful. Human reason has triumphed, but at the terrible sacrifice of cutting asunder earth and heaven, man and God, hope and Paradise !

When the same process of removing difficulties for the satisfaction of the human reason comes to be applied to doctrinal religion, it must always begin with the Atonement ; for this is

the fundamental doctrine and the controlling centre of the gospel system, as it is also the hinge between the soul and its God in a religious point of view. For as the great battles of the world raged around Palestine for its possession, so have the great moral contests, for ages not yet finished, raged around the doctrine of the Cross for its rightful interpretation. The Atonement is ever the great moral prize for which Christian and Turk contend in oft-renewed and mortal combat. Let the Atonement be secured in its scriptural and experimental integrity, and the religious system cannot be essentially wrong. Let it be lost, and the religious system cannot be essentially right. It is to be expected, therefore, that the human reason will strive specially to level this great central doctrine down to its own low plain. Hence, removing the supernatural, the deep, the inscrutable, in doctrinal and experimental religion, can only be accomplished by taking successive steps downward from the mysterious and wonderful hill of Calvary.

Again, the ease and naturalness with which steps may be taken downward from the Atonement, may be accounted for by the prevailing littleness and feebleness of faith. It requires clear and strong faith, and the deepest and truest Christian experience, to be able to stand on the top of Calvary and receive this great mystery of godliness in its spiritualizing and transforming power. It was the strength of Abraham's faith that enabled him to see Christ's day with gladness. All men have not this faith and experience. Unbelief is the besetting and blinding sin of the Christian. We ought not to be astonished, therefore, if many learned and good men are unable to receive this profound and divine remedy for sin in all the fulness of the Scripture representations, and in all the positiveness of the writings of the greatest and best men of the Church. We may expect to find many so-called improvements and re-statements, to be but steps downward from the divine plan of saving grace.

It should also be taken into the account that moral courage is not a natural grace, or an easy acquirement. In many persons it seems to be the hardest and last of all the attainments in Christian virtue. In the face of carnal misunderstanding and of learned scepticism, it is far easier to invent plausible com-

promises and medium courses that serve to quiet the conscience, than to stand firmly against the tide and the storm, upon the old-fashioned, despised platform of apostles and prophets. Moral courage is far rarer than physical courage, and many persons are constitutionally deficient in both. It is difficult for them to become soldiers. Often it is easier to face bristling bayonets than to meet reproach and obloquy in "contending for the faith once delivered to the saints." And every Christian needs that this should be an important one of the inspired injunctions, "giving all diligence, add to your faith (*ἀρετῇ*,) *courage*." As error is one of the parents of sin, the Christian warfare is largely a contest for doctrinal truth; and there will be found, as in every war, many who desire peace at any price. Pusillanimity is often mistaken for charity, and so, easily reconciles the weak, the indolent, the selfish, to every class and party but one.

Moreover, we shall make no attempt to decide just how far downward lies the dividing step between saving faith and fatal scepticism. It is dangerous to begin to go downward, for each step taken renders the taking of the next more easy and probable. All who descend do not go down precisely the same way. There may be great variation in rapidity, in process, and direction. The Atonement being highest, steps are found on every side, differing in length, in number, and in quality; but all beginning from this crowning doctrine; "what think ye of Christ," being everywhere the test both of theology and piety. The dividing line between real faith and real scepticism would be different on different sides, as the different stairways have been wrought out and perfected in different ages and under different influences and degrees of light and heat. The state of the heart having so great influence over the theological views, and the theological views having so great influence upon the state of the heart, the separating line between the savingly true and the fatally defective, will often be difficult to fix, as it must vary with the experience, the light, the prejudices, and constitution of different individuals. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God;" "but he that is spiritual judgeth all things."

This may be safely predicated, that a really renewed person, or church consisting chiefly of renewed persons, placed by unto-

ward circumstances on the lower theological steps, will surely climb upwards with more or less rapidity towards the true scriptural atonement; and really false professors and denominations, placed by favoring circumstances upon the higher theological steps, will surely go downward, and be continually looking for old steps, or hewing out new ones, by which they may make descent for themselves and their allies more gradual, easy, and less startling. Our object, therefore, is to expose tendencies and processes towards ultimate fatal results, rather than to fix the particular boundaries of Christian charity. We shall notice particular steps in the different processes mainly for the purpose of pointing out how uniformly these processes begin from the Atonement.

If we begin with the Papists we see at a glance that both logically and historically the first step in the downward process was the denial of the sufficiency in itself of Christ's Atonement, the second step was, necessarily, the rejection of imputation. The third, very naturally, was the addition of human merit to supplement that of Christ. Then followed penance, purgatory, and the whole round of perversions and abuses which made the Romish Church the mother of harlots.

The Romanists did not reject original sin, nor the divinity of Christ, nor the necessity of repentance and faith, nor future punishment; they did not even set aside the Atonement; they only perverted it by subtracting one of its essential elements, and the consequence was ruin to the whole system. The superstructure of a building may be complete in all its parts; but it will ere long fall to ruins if the corner-stone be divided and imperfect. Holding fast the other doctrines did not save them from general corruption. Holding fast the Atonement is an adequate correction and safeguard. The other doctrines are not central. No one of them spans the whole structure. This is the keystone of the arch. The other doctrines revolve around, and are held in their orbits by, this centre of gravitation, — the Atonement.

The work of the Reformation was to bring the Church back to faith in the full, sufficient, expiatory, and substitutionary nature of the atoning sufferings of Christ. In Hagenbach's "History of Doctrines," this process of departure from scriptural

Atonement by the Romish Church is fully traced. The learned Duns Scotus, at the beginning of the fourteenth century, fairly stands as the theological representative of ripened Romanism, as Luther and Melancthon found it. From pp. 354–5, 2d vol. Hagenbach, Am. ed., we make the following extracts:

“As Protestants and Roman Catholics agreed in resting their doctrines concerning theology and Christology on the basis of the oecumenical symbols, [the Apostles’ Creed, the Nicene, and the Athanasian.] so they espoused in common the doctrine of Atonement as given in Anselm’s theory of satisfaction, only with this difference, that (in connection with other principles) the Protestants gave the preference to that aspect of this theory presented by Thomas Aquinas, while the Roman Catholics, on the contrary, were favorable (at least in part), to the scheme of Duns Scotus. . . . On the one hand, they (the Protestants) so extended the idea of vicarious suffering, as to make it include the divine curse (*mors aeterna*) — an opinion which was combated by the divines of the Romish Church.”

“There were indeed some eminent Roman Catholic writers, among them even Bellarmine, who sided with Thomas Aquinas, but (to judge from occasional expressions) it would appear that even with them the scheme of Duns Scotus had in some respects greater authority. Comp. Baur, p. 345 with p. 348. A further difference was this, that in the opinion of the Roman Catholics, by the death of Christ, satisfaction was made only for guilt contracted before baptism; while only the *eternal* punishment, due to mortal sins committed after baptism, has been remitted; so that Christians have themselves to make satisfaction for temporal punishment.”

On p. 47 of the same volume, we are shown the fundamental distinction between the views of these two representative men, Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus; and we find the source of departure to be at the Atonement.

“Thus Thomas Aquinas brought the priestly office of Christ prominently forward, and laid great stress upon the superabounding merit of his death. Duns Scotus went to the other extreme, denying its sufficiency; but he supposed a voluntary acceptance on the part of God. Wycliff and Wessel attached importance to the theory of satisfaction in its practical bearing upon evangelical piety, and thus introduced the period of the Reformation.”

It is a noticeable fact, which may be better explained as we proceed, that Duns Scotus laid great stress upon the Freedom of the Will.

That the whole Romish system of steps downward begins with diminishing the doctrine of Atonement, setting aside some of its elemental facts, is evident from the standard volume, entitled, "*Moral Theology of Peter Dens*," as prepared for the use of Romish seminaries and students of theology. Under the head of Justification the following language is used :

"What are the principal errors of our heretics in this matter?
Ans. 2. That justification is not effected through habitual grace dwelling in the soul, but through the alone righteousness of Christ imputed to us. . . . Prove against the heretics, that justification is formally effected through the application of habitual grace dwelling in the soul; but not through the righteousness of Christ outwardly imputed to us."

Then follow ingenious arguments to parry the force of some of the strong passages of Scripture, which remind us of other similar attempts in the same direction, for which we have greater reason to blush. It is affirmed that where Christ is said to be "made to us of God, wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification; and where Christ is called our peace, life, salvation, &c., the language "Ought to be received in a causal not a formal sense; for it is only meant, that Christ is the meritorious cause of our justification." (!)

Such, with all the vast corruptions and darkness involved, are the steps of the Papacy downward from that grand peculiarity of the Gospel which had been before a stumbling-block to Jews and foolishness to Greeks.

There is in the history of the Church a very marked stairway, starting from the Scripture doctrine of the Atonement, down to Pelagianism. The semi-Pelagians of different ages and classes pause at a landing a little higher in the scale; while the Arians and Socinians or Unitarians descend still lower and reject altogether both the necessity of an atonement in order to forgiveness of sin, and the proper divinity of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit. Infidels can only be said to be a step or two lower down, though they maintain that circumstances are the sole causes of virtue, and that the life, death, and doctrines of Christ are altogether useless, and consequently that the Scriptures are but an imposition on human credulity.

Though Pelagius was opposed and vanquished by Augustine

in the fifth century, yet Pelagianism as a system has continued to the present time to be the marked antagonist of the orthodox faith. The steps which the Pelagians of different varieties and names take downward from the Atonement are nearly in the following order: First, "That the law is as good a means of salvation (*lex sic mittit ad regnum cœlorum*) as the gospel." (Hag. vol. i. p. 297.) Or, as we find the views of the original sect, stated in "The Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge," p. 919, "That the grace of God is given according to our merits," and, "That the law qualified men for the kingdom of heaven, and was founded upon equal promises with the gospel." This is an indirect and roundabout yet real departure from the necessity and alone sufficiency of the Atonement for removing sin. Says the apostle in Rom. viii. 3, "For what the law could not do" ("namely, condemn sin, without destroying the sinner," see "Bengel's Gnomon," in loco,) "in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin" (by a sacrifice for sin) "condemned" (removed) "sin" (which was laid on the Son of God) "in the flesh." This perversion of the nature and design of the Atonement as expiatory and compensating, prepared the way for all the errors in doctrine which the Pelagians of every shade and period desired to bring in. And we see not how, such as they were, they could have been plausibly brought in without first undermining the integrity of the atoning work of Christ.

The second step of Pelagianism downward was the denial of original sin and innate depravity. "Adam's sin injured only himself, and not the human race." "New-born infants are in the same condition in which Adam was previous to the fall, (*ante prævaricationem*)."

Hag. v. 1, p. 297.

The denial of man's sinful nature being a leading practical object of those who travel down these steps, it is made very prominent in discussion and in the histories of doctrines; while the new position in relation to the Atonement is less apparent, like the hidden source of a fatal disease. Hence, at first view, many might regard the position in relation to human depravity as the first rather than the second step in the series. However, it logically must occupy the second place; inasmuch as, the divine wisdom being assumed, the remedy implies the existence

of the sin, while the existence of the sin does not imply the remedy. In other words, sin, placed first in a series or system, would argue nothing in regard to remedy; while a remedy placed first is proof positive of sin. Moreover, man being, as he is, disinclined to admit a sinful, apostate nature, nothing is so natural, by way of convincing him, as placing the amazing provision for his recovery at the head of all argument; just as a view of the cross begets a sense of guilt deeper than is in the power of independent reasoning to do. Holding the Atonement in its full integrity and significance as implying that "If Christ died for all, then were all dead," the Pelagians never could have rejected substantially, utter human sinfulness, and utter human dependence on divine, gracious, gospel recovery.

The third step in this series downward is the absolute freedom of the human will to good as well as to evil.

"Pelagius admitted that man, in his moral activity, stands in need of divine aid, and could, therefore, speak of the grace of God as assisting the imperfections of man by a variety of provisions. He supposed, however, this grace of God to be something external, and added, to the efforts put forth by the free will of man; it can even be merited by good will." Hag. vol. i. p. 301.

"In the system of Pelagius, everything depends upon the principle of the freedom of the will; this is the determining and fundamental conception in his doctrine of sin and of grace. Freedom, as the absolute capacity of choice (*liberum arbitrium*), to determine equally for good or evil, appeared to him in such a degree to be the substantial good of human nature, that he even reckoned the capacity for evil as a *bonum naturæ*, since we cannot choose good without in like manner being able to choose evil." Ibid. p. 303.

A fourth step follows as a matter of course, namely, the denial of electing grace, effectual calling, divine decrees, predestination. "Man can withstand grace." It is easy to see that, in this system, God is well-nigh dethroned. Wherever it has had sway, piety has rapidly declined, and the way has been smoothed to the various forms of unblushing infidelity. Pelagian tendencies to exalt human freedom have ever been found to carry with them a natural antagonism both to the doctrine of man's apostasy and depravity, and of God's decrees; thus undermining every cardinal doctrine of the Gospel. And that

these tendencies have a logical and necessary connection with the previous perversion of the Atonement is plain, though it has not so often been pointed out. A wise remedy will correspond, in extent and character, with the extent and character of the disease to be removed. In proportion as the Atonement, as a provided remedy, is diminished, the human sinfulness and apostasy to be remedied are diminished. And in proportion as the human sinfulness and apostasy are diminished, the human ability and freedom of will may be untruthfully exalted; and to the same extent must the divine decrees and government give way, and become conditional or even nominal. Hagenbach, in speaking of the conflict of religious opinions to which the Reformation gave rise, recognizes this relation, except that he did not trace it back to the Atonement as we have done. He says, (vol. ii. p. 268):

“The more rigid the views of theologians on the doctrine of original sin and the moral inability of man, the more firmly they would maintain that the decrees of God are unconditional. Hence it is not surprising that Roman Catholics, Arminians, and most of all the Socinians, endeavored in a more or less Pelagian manner, to satisfy the claims of human freedom.”

That Pelagianism tends downward to fatal scepticism and proves unsatisfactory to the pious, has been everywhere manifest, from the fifth to the nineteenth century. The “*Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*” most justly sums up its earlier results in a sentence, (p. 919):

“The Pelagian controversy, which began with the doctrines of grace and original sin, was extended to predestination, and excited continual discord and division in the Church.”

Bengel, in the seventeenth century, bitterly complains of the Pelagian tendencies of his age as leading men to become increasingly strangers to the effects of grace. Indeed, its steady and necessary approaches to Socinianism and infidelity became so early manifest that, before the close of the fifth century, its advocates devised a modified and more plausible form of it which was named semi-Pelagianism, and which, with slight variations, has prevailed widely among the secret rejecters of the expiatory nature of the Atonement down to the present time.

John Cassian, a disciple of Chrysostom, is said to have devised this "middle course" between Pelagianism and the orthodox faith. The germ of semi-Pelagianism consists in regarding "The natural man neither as morally healthy (as Pelagius did), nor as morally dead (like Augustine), but as diseased and morally weakened." The leading theses of the system have ever been, "That God did not dispense his grace to one more than another, in consequence of predestination;" "That man, before he received grace, was capable of faith and holy desires;" and "That man was born free, and was, consequently, capable of resisting the influences of grace, or of complying with its suggestions." The design and use of this shrewd "improvement" in theology is sharply drawn by Hagenbach in his enumeration of different heresies. "2. The heresy of the Pelagians, who never were able to form a distinct sect, but by means of a modified system (semi-Pelagianism) kept a back-door open to creep now and then into the Church, from which they had been excluded by the more strict doctrinal decisions."

Another process downward from the true Scriptural Atonement may be designated the Universalist stairway. In this general class of Universalist theories a great variety of sceptical opinion is included, especially among German speculatists. But these sceptical opinions may all be traced back to original perversion of the Atonement, either in relation to its nature, or its design and application. The radical defect consists in such superficial views of the character of God, and of divine justice, as renders any expiation, or proper satisfaction to immutable justice, unnecessary. Constitutional abhorrence of sin prompting inexorably to punish, or proper and benevolent justice, is set aside from the Divine character. Consequently Atonement is a pledge, a moral instrumentality, an expedient; and sin must be a trifling thing, comparatively, certainly not to be regarded with infinite wrath on the part of God, nor deserving of capital, endless punishment.

The Restorationists argue that the Atonement is, either from its nature, or by divine and special appointment, the absolute and unconditional release of the race from all penal suffering or proper punishment; though disciplinary sufferings, for the purification of character, may be inflicted either in this world

or the next, or both. It is not the providing a way whereby prisoners may become "prisoners of hope," but it is the utter demolition of the prison. With them, the atoning provision is not that of the gracious King, staying his just wrath, and sending the herald to throw open the prison-doors and proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; but it is the mighty conqueror unconditionally and arbitrarily breaking down all walls, and destroying the prison itself instead of the prisoners.

Others interpret the Atonement not as the ground, but simply the means for accomplishing reconciliation; an expedient, either for public, perhaps governmental, ends, or an expedient to satisfy moral feelings, in the purpose of accomplishing reconciliation which might have been accomplished without it. It is not expiatory, satisfactory, or substitutionary; it is not the rendering of pardon and salvation consistent and possible; they say it was consistent and possible before; but it is the means and expedient for bringing about what is of itself consistent and proper. It is not the providing of the bread and water of life, but the ministration of them, rendering them palatable and effectual. Some affirm that Christ died merely to convince men of God's saving and eternal love. Others go still farther, and make the whole object of Christ's death to be a touching and powerful means of exciting and quickening man's natural virtues. In none of these cases is the Atonement avowedly rejected; it is rather gloried in as if made broader, more rational and effective for good. Rejection is far down the scale, and on the borders of acknowledged infidelity.

The steps of this broad, downward way in theological reasoning may be marked somewhat as follows, beginning at the top of the series. First, Semi-Arminianism. In this class are embraced those who, in reality, adopt the characteristic error of full Arminianism, but attempt to stop short of some of its logical sequences and practical tendencies. The fundamental principle of this system is that Christ in the Atonement did not make satisfaction to divine justice in any proper sense, but simply to the governmental justice of God. It is essential to this theory that justice, as an absolute and controlling attribute, should be denied a place in the nature of God. Justice, which

prompts God to punish for sin because it is sin, is rejected, and the prevention of crime, regard for the law, and the maintenance of the order and welfare of the universe, are made the whole object of punishment, even in the divine government. Accordingly the Atonement, which is to take the place of punishment, has merely the same object. That the tendency of this system is to put the doctrine of eternal punishment upon the ground of expediency, and into the shade, is manifest; for it has covertly wrapped up in it the germ of Universalism, whose adherents are uniformly and instinctively arrayed against capital punishment in all governments.

We have already stated that the fundamental principle of this first step downward from the Atonement is, that the prevention of crime and the promotion of order and government constitute the great end of punishment, and consequently of Atonement. When these ends are answered, justice is satisfied. That sin deserves punishment for its own sake is denied, and hence the evil and wrong of sin are fundamentally diminished. This will account for the prevailing decrease of deep and pungent conviction for sin wherever the semi-Arminian theology is countenanced.

How utterly opposed this theory is to the whole tenor of Scripture may be seen by referring to the earlier parts of this discussion, where Christ is constantly presented in the Bible as a sacrifice. He bore our sins; the chastisement of our peace was upon him. He propitiated God; became a ransom; was made sin that we might be made righteousness. But this theory logically denies that Christ in the work of Atonement wrought out any righteousness which may constitute the ground of the sinner's justification. It merely makes pardon possible, and opens the way for the sinner to create a righteousness of his own, whereas Paul's whole hope is in being found in Christ, not having his own righteousness, but the righteousness which is by faith of Jesus Christ. It annihilates the Scripture doctrine of justification, that "Act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight only for the righteousness of Christ, imputed unto us, and received by faith alone;" and leaves to us only the hope that the demands of public justice have been so met in Christ that

God will not be obliged to punish us forever. It sets aside the chief element of saving faith, that grace whereby, renouncing all dependence on ourselves, we receive and rest upon Christ alone for salvation, putting on Christ, being in Christ, having a vital union with him as our life; and gives us in the place of all this, repentance as a prevention of crime in ourselves, laying aside our rebellion, submitting ourselves to God, and trusting that the Great Ruler will not be obliged, by governmental necessity, to execute the penalty of sin upon us, on the ground of Christ's having done what will avail equally well for the prevention of crime in others, and for the upholding and honoring of the law and government for the public good.

Semi-Arminianism was first most clearly drawn out as a system by Hugo Grotius in the former part of the sixteenth century. Grotius was ranked among the Arminians of his time, but was possessed of such an acute intellect that he could not avoid seeing the heretical tendencies of Arminianism, and yet his heart seemed not prepared to receive its only Scriptural and logical alternative. And so, to clear himself from the charge of Socinianism, he labored to open a *via media*, and prepared his "*Defensio Fidei Catholicæ de Satisfactione Christi.*" He undertook to make a subtle distinction between *satisfactio* and *solutio*, carrying the idea that God, by inflicting death upon Christ, thus giving an example of punishment, had arbitrarily set aside the necessity of a real satisfaction to divine justice. He, like Socinius, "attached principal importance to the moral impression which the death of Christ is calculated to produce;" and this impression "consists in the *exhibition* of the punishment due to sin." "It was based upon political rather than jurial premises," and "could not satisfy either the feelings or the reason of Christians." Some of his followers went a step farther and affirmed "that the death of Christ was a *solemn declaration* that God will be merciful to sinners," and, of course, hold the demands of justice, if there be any such, in eternal abeyance. (Hag. vol. ii. pp. 355, 360, 361, and 498.) (Bib. Sac. vol. ix. p. 259. The Grotian Theory, a translation from Baur, by Dr. L. Swain.)

Various attempts have been made in different ages to devise or revive something like this midway Grotian theory, which

we have called semi-Arminianism; something which shall satisfy the Socinian reasoning and yet, in a general way, conform to the language of Scripture and the Christian feelings. Our space will allow us only briefly to refer to two recent instances of tendency downward in this direction under the lead of authors of almost Grotian skill in dialectic subtleties. The first of these may be seen in a small volume published in 1845, by Dr. N. S. S. Beman, in review of a pamphlet entitled, "Christ the only sacrifice, or the Atonement in its relations to God and man." On pp. 131, 133, 135, 142, Dr. Beman says, justice, in its "common, appropriate sense, was not satisfied by the Atonement of Jesus Christ." "The law, or justice, that is, distributive justice, as expressed in the law, has received no satisfaction at all." It is "a symbolical and substantive expression of God's regard to the moral law." "To fix indelibly this impression on the heart of the sinner is the object of the Atonement." Dr. Beman makes this the design of penalty "to operate as a powerful motive to obedience;" and this the necessity of the Atonement, "to secure the order and prosperity of the universe," pp. 127-8. See Review of Beman, in *Essays and Reviews*, by Charles Hodge, D. D., p. 129.

The other of these recent attempts to revive the Grotian theory may be gleaned from the Introductory Essay to a volume entitled "The Atonement," by Edwards A. Park, D. D. The aim of the Introductory Essay, and of the volume, seems to be to draw from the writings of the great New England divines, the author's "New" or "Edwardean Theory" of the Atonement. On page 10, "the main principles" of this theory are stated in nine propositions, four of which read as follows:

"Secondly, The sufferings of our Lord satisfied the general justice of God, but did not satisfy his distributive justice."

"Thirdly, The humiliation, pains, and death of our Redeemer were equivalent in meaning to the punishment threatened in the moral law, and thus they satisfied Him who is determined to maintain the honor of this law, but they did not satisfy the demands of the law itself for our punishment."

"Fifthly, The law and the distributive justice of God, although honored by the life and death of Christ, will yet eternally demand the punishment of every one who has sinned."

"Ninthly, The Atonement is *useful* on men's account, and in order to furnish new motives to holiness, but it is *necessary* on God's account, and in order to *enable* him, as a consistent Ruler, to pardon any, even the smallest sin, and therefore to bestow on sinners any, even the smallest favor."

In the word "Ruler," in this last proposition, the Governmental theory is fully avowed ; and here is the germ of Universalism, as we have before seen. The Atonement is necessary, not on account of God's own nature and attributes, but to enable him *as a Ruler*, to pardon. It was not necessary that God might be *just* in pardoning, but it was necessary for public ends. Atonement takes the place of punishment. Therefore God threatens to punish, not from any promptings in his own nature and attributes, but for public, governmental ends. Says the Universalist, therefore sin is only a governmental evil ; there is nothing in God's nature and attributes that constrains him to punish ; and the ends of government may be met by punishment that is not eternal, but circumstantial and limited, as sin is circumstantial and limited.

To establish such an "Edwardean theory," or gain countenance for it from the writings of the New England divines, is a manifest impossibility to all who are familiar with their writings. It is like the attempt to prove Swedenborgianism, Universalism, or any other ism from the Bible. A few passages and expressions standing out of their connection and scope may always be found pliable. Least of all is it possible to show any leanings towards the Grotian theory in the works of the elder Edwards and Dr. Hopkins, the greatest of the New England theologians. Who can doubt that they were familiar with every such abortive effort in the previous history of the church to find a safe middle ground between such logical and theological antipodes ? In this discussion, on pages 16 and 17 of this volume, we have made quotations from the elder Edwards, showing his unequivocal belief in the sufferings of Christ as making full satisfaction to divine justice, by answering the full penalty of the divine law, for "the sin that was imputed to him, or offered that to God that was fully and completely equivalent to what we owed to divine justice for our

sins." We could quote many pages from the writings of both Edwards and Hopkins to the same positive purport ; — one from the latter must suffice.

"Here (Rom. iii. 25, 26,) the design of the Redeemer is expressed, and the great thing he is to accomplish is to maintain and declare the righteousness, the rectitude, and unchangeable truth and perfection of God, in opening a way by his blood, his sufferings unto death, for the free pardon of sinful man, consistent with his rectoral justice and truth, and doing that which is right and just, both with respect to himself, his law and government, and all the subjects of his kingdom.

"The work of the Redeemer, therefore, has a primary respect to the law of God, to maintain and honor that, so that sinners may be pardoned and saved consistent with that, without setting that aside, or showing the least disregard to it, in the requirements and threatenings of it ; but that it may be perfectly fulfilled, and especially that the threatening might be properly and completely executed, without which God could not be true or just in pardoning or saving the sinner. It was, therefore, predicted that he should 'magnify the law, and make it honorable.' (Is. xlii. 21.) And Christ himself declares that he came into the world to fulfil the law. 'Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets ; I am not come to destroy but to fulfil. For verily, I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.' (Matt. v. 17, 18.) The law could not be fulfilled by Jesus Christ without his suffering the penalty of it, and obeying it perfectly. For to give up the penalty, and not execute the threatening of the law, when it is transgressed, is to dissolve and destroy the law. For a penalty is essential to a law, and where there is no penalty threatened there is no law, as has been shown.

"Therefore, had the Redeemer undertaken to save men, without regard to the penalty of the law, and suffering it himself, he would have come to make void the law and destroy it, to all intents and purposes. He could not 'make reconciliation, and bring in everlasting righteousness,' (Dan. ix. 24,) which it was predicted he should, without suffering the penalty of the law, the everlasting rule of righteousness. In doing this his love of righteousness and hatred of iniquity was exercised and displayed in the most signal manner, and to the highest degree. Therefore, it is with respect to this regard which he paid to the divine law in suffering the penalty and obeying the precepts of it, that it is said to him, 'Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity ; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil

of gladness above thy fellows.' (Heb. i. 9; Ps. xiv. 7.) . . . Sinful men were under the curse of the law; and in order to redeem them, the Redeemer must take their place under the law, and suffer the penalty, bear the curse for them, and in their room, which is expressed yet more fully, and in the most plain and unequivocal words, in the preceding chapter. 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.' By being made a curse for us, can be nothing else but suffering the penalty, the curse of the law, under which we were, and which man must have suffered, had not the Redeemer suffered it for him, as he could not be redeemed in any other way without destroying the law." Hopkins' Works, vol. i. pp. 323-4.

Having dwelt thus particularly upon the first step in what we have termed the Universalist stairway, but few words will be necessary to indicate those which naturally follow. After semi-Arminianism the step to full Arminianism is not distant, and will be taken by their followers, though the leaders should hesitate long. Arminianism proceeds practically to bring down the character of sin, and the nature of human sinfulness, to the same level to which divine justice and atonement have been brought by the former step. That man, by the fall, has become naturally and totally depraved, is denied. Why should it be believed after a governmental expedient which has nothing of a penal nature in it has been deemed sufficient to meet the demands of divine justice, and to make full atonement for sin? Consequently Arminians affirm that the human will is not radically corrupt, nor wholly opposed to God; and that one man is saved and another not, is owing, not to the grace of God, but to the free will of man. The necessity of grace is not denied, but made alike universal in every case and in every sense. The necessity of grace is not denied, but its efficacy is made to depend on the human will. They affirm that the death and sufferings of Christ are applied alike to every individual of mankind. Or in other words, that redemption differs in no way from atonement, but is a mere common provision, made in every sense conditional, thus substantially denying gratuitous election, decrees, foreknowledge, perseverance, &c.

At this point the way is prepared for the third step downward, which is the substantial rejection of Regeneration as an

instantaneous and radical change of the heart and will, wrought by the new creative power of the Holy Ghost. What need is there of divine regeneration if the will is not radically corrupt? On the one hand regeneration is made to degenerate into a mere resolution, determination, or emotion of the sinner. On the other it becomes a result of baptism, or follows gradually the observance of certain forms, rights, or church ordinances.

The fourth step is one of general doubt in regard both to the full inspiration of the Scriptures and the supernatural in religion. Most that cannot be resolved into general laws is rejected by one process or another. Here the way becomes slippery, and humid fogs, and murky and thick atmosphere prevail. Few that go down thus far ever return. They do not always give up the general forms and vague hopes of religion. The immortal dreamer of Bedford Jail presents the shepherds leading the Pilgrims, first to the top of a hill called Error, which was very steep on the farther side, and bidding them look down to the bottom. "So Christian and Hopeful looked down, and saw at the bottom several men dashed all to pieces by a fall that they had from the top." Then they led them to the top of Mount Caution and bid them look afar off upon several men walking up and down among the tombs; and they say to their astonished guests, "These men (pointing to them among the tombs,) came once on pilgrimage, as you do now, even until they came to that same stile. And because the right way was rough in that place, they chose to go out of it into that meadow, and there were taken by Giant Despair, and cast into Doubting Castle, where, after they had awhile been kept in the dungeon, he at last did put out their eyes, and led them among those tombs, where he has left them to wander to this very day, that the saying of the wise man might be fulfilled, "He that wandereth out of the way of understanding shall remain in the congregation of the dead."

ARTICLE II.

GEORGE HERBERT.

Walton's Lives: The Life of Mr. George Herbert, Prebendary of Salisbury Cathedral. By IZAAK WALTON. New edition, with Illustrative Notes, Index, etc. Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co. For William Veazie. 1861.

The Complete Works of George Herbert. London and Edinburgh: T. Nelson & Sons. 1854.

SAYS the thoughtful author of that charming little volume, "The Patience of Hope," "Some quaint old English poems and devout essays send a fragrance into the very soul; to look into them is to open the tomb of a saint, and find it full of roses." Such has been our experience with the writings of George Herbert.

But in this age, whose face is set towards the future, the treasures of the past are apt to be overlooked or depreciated. The richly stored caskets of jewels which the fathers have bequeathed to us, have, to many, seemed too dusty and unpromising to be worth unlocking. Happily there are signs that the craving for novelty is becoming somewhat satiated, and that truth and beauty, of whatever age and circumstance, are finding more just appreciation. Let us hope that Herbert, that true poet of the church, may share in such a restoration. The quaint conceits and crowded imagery which have been superseded by a simpler and more natural style, were in his day esteemed the richest setting for the jewels of thought. And it cannot be creditable to our taste or judgment if we throw away the precious stone, because its casket does not please us. To change the figure: if "the outside of the vase is scrawled over with odd shapes and writing, within are precious liquors, and healing medicines, and rare mixtures of far-gathered herbs and flowers."

The life of Herbert is itself a nobler poem than any which he wrote. He was born at the Castle of Montgomery, in Wales,

April 3, 1593; being the fifth of ten children of Richard and Magdalen Newport Herbert. He "spent much of his childhood in a sweet content under the eye and care of his prudent mother," who seems to have been unusually fitted for the task which devolved upon her at her husband's death. It was probably as true of her with regard to George, as to her eldest son, Edward, that "she managed her power over him without any such rigid sourness as might make her company a torment to her child; but with such a sweetness and compliance with the recreations and pleasures of youth, as did incline him willingly to spend much time in the company of his dear and careful mother." Dr. Donne has characterized her in one of his poems as "*The Autumnal Beauty*," and dedicated to her a volume of "*Holy Hymns and Sonnets*," of which Walton says, in his quaint and touching way: "These hymns are now lost to us; but doubtless they were such as they two now sing in heaven."

At the age of fifteen (1608) Herbert entered Trinity College, Cambridge, where his progress is sufficiently indicated by the fact that he was made Bachelor of Arts in 1611; Major Fellow of the College in 1615; and in 1619 was advanced to the distinguished position of Orator for the University, which he retained for eight years with signal honor to himself and his college; attracting the favorable notice of the most eminent men of that period, and of the king himself, who gave him a sinecure which Queen Elizabeth had formerly bestowed upon her favorite, Philip Sidney. It seems probable that he entertained, for a long time, strong expectations of preferment, which, however, were doomed to disappointment, "God having provided some better thing" for him than worldly advancement. Upon resigning his hopes at court he retired to Kent, where he lived in the most secluded manner, and in this retreat —

"He had many conflicts with himself, whether he should return to the painted pleasures of a court life, or betake himself to a study of divinity, and enter into sacred orders, to which his dear mother had often persuaded him. These were such conflicts as they only can know that have endured them; for ambitious desires and the outward glory of this world are not easily laid aside; but at last God inclined him to put on a resolution to serve Him at His altar."

The date of Herbert's ordination is not certainly known,

but in 1626 he was made Prebend of Layton Ecclesia, in Huntingdonshire. Three years later, being out of health, he paid a visit to a friend in Wiltshire, and while there married Jane Danvers, the daughter of a great admirer of Herbert — Charles Danvers, of Bainton. Herbert and Miss Danvers had long known each other by report, and a short courtship sufficed. They were married three days after the first interview, nor had they ever reason to repent their haste. Walton says of them :

"The Eternal Lover of mankind made them happy in each other's mutual and equal affections and compliance ; indeed, so happy that there never was any opposition between them, unless it were a contest which should most incline to a compliance with each other's desires ; . . . and . . . this mutual content and love and joy did receive a daily augmentation, by such daily obligingness to each other as still added such new affluences to the former fulness of these divine souls, as was only improvable in heaven, where they now enjoy it."

Some three months after his marriage, Herbert was presented with the living of Bemerton, near Salisbury, where he spent the remainder of his life.

"Here," says Walton, "I must stop, and bespeak the reader to prepare for an almost incredible story of the great sanctity of the short remainder of Herbert's holy life ; a life so full of charity, humility, and all Christian virtues, that it deserves the eloquence of St. Chrysostom to commend and declare it."

For the space of a little more than two years which Herbert lived after his removal to Bemerton, he was unwearied in the labors of his office. Careful in the instruction, and tender in the consolation of his flock ; solemnly exhorting to the way of holiness, and steadily pursuing it himself ; "he made every day's sanctity a step towards that kingdom where impurity cannot enter." His chief relaxation was music, "in which heavenly art he was a most excellent master, and did himself compose many divine hymns or anthems which he set to music, and sung to his lute or viol." He went regularly to a private "music meeting," at Salisbury, saying that music "did relieve his drooping spirits, compose his distracted thoughts, and raise his weary soul so far above earth that it gave him an earnest of the joys of heaven before he possessed them." Herbert has written thus of "Church Musick" :

" Sweetest of sweets, I thank you : when displeasure
 Did through my bodie wound my minde,
 You took me thence, and in your house of pleasure
 A daintie lodging me assign'd.

' Now I in you without a bodie move,
 Rising and falling with your wings :
 We both together sweetly live and love,
 Yet say sometimes, *God help poore Kings !*

" Comfort, I'll die ; for if you poste from me,
 Sure I shall do so, and much more ;
 But if I travell in your companie,
 You know the way to heaven's doore."

From these joys he was not long to be detained. Consumption had fastened itself upon him. But his increasing weakness, while it compelled him to give up, one by one, those labors in which he had so delighted, revealed to him more fully day by day the pleasing prospects of eternity. He sends this message to a friend : " Tell him that I do not repine, but am pleased with my want of health ; and tell him my heart is fixed on that place where true joy is only to be found ; and that I long to be there, and do wait for my appointed change with hope and patience." " The Sunday before his death, he rose suddenly from his couch, called for one of his instruments, took it into his hand, and said —

' My God, my God,
 My music shall find Thee,
 And every thing
 Shall have His attribute to sing."

And, having tuned it, he played a simple prelude, and then sang :

" The Sundays of man's life,
 Threaded together on Time's string,
 Make bracelets to adorn the wife
 Of the eternal, glorious King :
 On Sundays heaven's door stands ope ;
 Blessings are plentiful and rife,
 More plentiful than hope."

Thus he continued, " meditating, and praying, and rejoicing, till the day of his death." Then, surrounded by his family,

he "passed," to use his own words, "a conflict with his last enemy, and overcame him by the merits of his Master, Jesus." After that last struggle he remained serene and tranquil for some hours, and breathed out his spirit in these words: "Lord, forsake me not now my strength faileth me, but grant me mercy for the merits of my Jesus. And now, Lord — Lord — now receive my soul." "I wish," says Izaak Walton, "if God shall be so pleased, that I may be so happy as to die like him."

Of Herbert's writings, Henry Vaughan, himself no mean poet, speaking of the impure tendencies of most of the poetry of that day, says: "The first that with any effectual success attempted a diversion of this foul and overflowing stream, was that blessed man, Mr. George Herbert, whose holy life and verse gained many pious converts, of whom I am the least."* A discriminating critic of later time † speaks of him thus:

"Herbert has, according to his degree, the distinctive peculiarities of Raffaele and Milton. His sweetness of fancy, his vigorous sense, and his happiness of idiom may be appreciated by all people; just as the grace and the dignity of the picture and the epic come home to the least refined observer. But there is a remoter and a delightfuller quality that requires a kindred heart to comprehend it. To a reader without a deep, catholic devotion, he is only the ingenious or the fantastic rhymer; to one who has that feeling, his verses are the strings of a musical instrument, making melody in themselves, and awaking sweet sounds in the hearts of those who hear it."

The fragrance of Herbert's genius is perennial. There is in it such a rich savor of Christ as renders it always congenial to the Christian soul; even as the leaves of some plants, after long keeping, though less fair outwardly than when taken from the stem, yet retain their sweet and healthful perfume, with added odors of association. We shall not enter into any extended criticism of these writings, partly because we prefer to reserve our space for more copious extracts than we could otherwise afford, and partly because these writings, appealing as they do to the heart, even more than to the intellect or the imagination, must be appreciated according to individual experi-

* Preface to "*Silex Scintillans*," p. 58.

† Rev. Robert Aris Wilmot. See Introduction to his edition of "*Herbert's Works*," p. 23.

ence, and left largely to the criticism of feeling. We must, however, give Herbert's own testimony in regard to them. A few days before his death he said to a friend who stood by his bed: "Sir, I pray you deliver this little book to my dear brother, Farrer, and tell him he shall find in it a picture of the many spiritual conflicts that have passed betwixt God and my soul, before I could subject mine to the will of my Master, in whose service I have now found perfect freedom. Desire him to read it, and then, if he think it may turn to the advantage of any poor soul, let it be made public; if not, let him burn it; for I and it are less than the least of God's mercies." The "little book" was "The Temple; or Sacred Poems and Private Ejaculations," the best known, at present, of the author's works, and undoubtedly the most interesting and valuable. As its name indicates, it is a collection of poems on sacred subjects, which, under quaint, and sometimes seemingly incongruous titles, present a rich store of spiritual and poetic beauty. The work gained an immediate popularity, rivalled only by the poetry of Cowley, who is now only known to scholars, while Herbert's muse is still singing to the ear of the Christian world as charmingly as ever.

The opening poem, "The Church Porch," less pleasing in diction, and less glowing with fancy than many others, has been said to be "a little hand-book of rules for the management of temper and conversation and business, which every child ought to get by heart." The following verses on church-behavior are a fair specimen of its style:

"In time of service, seal up both thine eies,
And send them to thine heart; that, spying sinne,
They may weep out the stains by them did rise:
Those doores being shut, all by the care comes in.
Who marks in church-time other symmetric,
Makes all their beautie his deformitie.

"Jest not at preacher's language or expression:
How know'st thou but thy sinnes made him misearrie?
Then turn thy faults and his into confession:
God sent him, whatsoe'er he be: O tarry,
And love him for his Master: his condition,
Though it be ill, makes him no ill Physician."

It is difficult to select from this treasure-house of jewels wherewith to fill most acceptably the few pages at our disposal. We wish chiefly to allure those who have never yet explored them, to these pleasant places whose springs of refreshment are most strengthening to the Zionward traveller. We give first the poem entitled "Gratefulnesse."

"Thou that hast giv'n so much to me,
Give one thing more, a gratefull heart.
See how Thy beggar works on Thee
By art.

"He makes Thy gifts occasion more;
And sayes, If he in this be crost,
All Thou hast giv'n him heretofore
Is lost.

"But Thou didst reckon, when at first
Thy word our hearts and hands did crave,
What it would come to at the worst
To save.

"Perpetuall knockings at Thy doore,
Tears sullyng Thy transparent rooms,
Gift upon gift; much would have more,
And comes.

"This notwithstanding, Thou wentst on,
And didst allow us all our noise:
Nay, Thou hast made a sigh and grone
Thy joyes.

"Not that Thou hast not still above
Much better tunes than grones can make;
But that these country-aïres Thy love
Did take.

"Wherefore I erie, and erie again;
And in no quiet canst Thou be,
Till I a thankfull heart obtain
Of Thee:

"Not thankfull, when it pleaseth me;
As if Thy blessings had spare dayes:
But such a heart, whose pulse may be
Thy praise."

These stanzas have the racy flavor of out-door grapes, rather than the soft smoothness of conservatory clusters. A poem requiring perhaps a longer acquaintance to procure it just appreciation, is called "Man's Medley." The change of measure in the lines is a kind of tripping musical accompaniment to the sentiment.

"Heark, how the birds do sing,
And woods do ring!
All creatures have their joy, and man hath his.
Yet, if we rightly measure,
Man's joy and pleasure
Rather hereafter than in present is.

"To this life, things of sense
Make their pretence;
In th' other, Angels have a right by birth:
Man ties them both alone,
And makes them one,
With th' one hand touching heaven, with th' other earth.

"In soul he mounts and flies;
In flesh he dies.
He wears a stuffe whose thread is coarse and round,
But trimm'd with curious lace,
And should take place
After the trimming, not the stuffe and ground.

"Not that he may not here
Taste of the cheer;
But as birds drink, and straight lift up their head,
So must he sip, and think
Of better drink
He may attain to, after he is dead.

"But as his joyes are double,
So is his trouble.
He hath two winters, other things but one:
Both frosts and thoughts do nip,
And bite his lip;
And he of all things fears two deaths alone.

"Yet ev'n the greatest griefs
May be reliefs,
Could he but take them right, and in their wayes.
Happie is he whose heart
Hath found the art
To turn his double pains to double praise."

A pensive thoughtfulness runs through these sprightly verses, as if the shadow of another life were casting its wing over present pleasures. It is characteristic of this writer. In all his gardens there is a sepulchre — not a dismal one, for the risen Christ has blessed and glorified it; still it is there with its solemn suggestiveness. Another of these pieces, “The Method,” is really a short sermon on self-examination, and ineffectual prayer. The turn of the self-questioning is well managed, as the application is most excellent. It would be a good help to meditation for closet-hours. He who wrote it evidently understood the secret of drawing nigh to God so as not to ask amiss. Its homely vernacular is one of its rare beauties. The italicizing is in the original, and is a part of its author’s conception.

“Poore heart, lament;
For, since thy God refuseth still,
There is some rub, some discontent,
Which cools His will.

“Thy Father *could*
Quickly effect what thou dost move;
For He is *Power*: and sure He *would*;
For He is *Love*.

“Go, search this thing,
Tumble thy breast, and turn thy book.
If thou hadst lost a glove or ring,
Wouldst thou not look?

“What do I see
Written above there? — *Yesterday*
I did behave me carelessly,
When I did pray.

“And should God’s care
To such indifferents chained be,
Who do not their own motions heare?
Is God lesse free?

“But stay! what’s there?
Late when I would have something done,
I had a motion to forbear;
Yet I went on.

“And should God’s care,
Which needs not man, be ty’d to those

Who heare not Him, but quickly heare
His utter foes ?

“Then once more pray ;
Down with thy knees, up with thy voice :
Seek pardon first, and God will say,
Glad heart, rejoice !”

Allusion has been made to the plentiful conceits and similes of these poems ; we are not prepared to call them, with another critic,* ridiculous, coarse, unpleasant. Fantastic, they doubtless often are, yet so unstudied and playful, as the sporting of a child, in their odd imagery, that the effect is far from “unpleasant.” It may be that Herbert’s “taste was very inferior to his genius.” This is true of others, as well, and particularly in times when taste has not reached its matured culture. It is a slow growth, and has much to do with the schools. But we demur to the judgment that “Herbert’s poetry alone would not have preserved his name,” with all its genius, and that his reputation lives chiefly through his prose writings, and the portrait of his amiable, godly character, done by “good old Walton.” † Coleridge’s opinion is far better. In his “Friend” this thoughtful scholar and man of letters writes : “Having mentioned the name of Herbert, that model of a man, a gentleman and a clergyman, let me add that the quaintness of some of his thoughts, not of his diction, than which nothing can be more pure, manly, and unaffected, has blinded modern readers to the great general merit of his poems, (and it may be also said, his prose writings,) which are for the most part exquisite in their kind.” The most generally known of his verses — on “Virtue,” beginning, “Sweet day ! so cool, so calm, so bright,” would have kept him from oblivion, were it the only star which his spirit lighted. What a delightful simplicity plays through the measures of the poem following, which he calls “A True Hymne” — devotion and criticism so aptly blended.

“My joy, my life, my crown !
My heart was meaning all the day,
Somewhat it fain would say ;
And still it runneth muttering up and down
With only this, *My joy, my life, my crown !*

* “Chambers’s Cyclopædia of English Literature,” I. 132. † Ibid.

" Yet slight not these few words ;
 If truly said, they may take part
 Among the best in art.
 The fineness which a hymne or psalme affords,
 Is when the soul unto the lines accords.

" He who craves all the minde,
 And all the soul, and strength, and time,
 If the words onely rhyme,
 Justly complains that somewhat is behinde
 To make His verse, or write a hymne in kinde.

" Whereas if th' heart be moved,
 Although the verse be somewhat scant,
 God doth supplie the want.
 As when th' heart sayes, (sighing to be approved,) *O, could I love !* and stops ; God writeth, *Loved.*"

This, entitled "The Flower," is pronounced by Coleridge "a delicious poem." It is one to be interpreted by the heart which has had its own "Songs in the Night," and brings to mind the thanksgiving of the Psalmist: "O Lord, Thou hast brought up my soul from the grave, Thou hast kept me alive that I should not go down to the pit. Sing unto the Lord, O ye saints of His, and give thanks at the remembrance of His holiness. For His anger endureth but a moment ; in His favor is life ; weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning." It is the song of the uncaged bird, but still a minor melody.

" How fresh, O Lord, how sweet and clean
 Are Thy returns ! ev'n as the flowers in spring ;
 To which, besides their own demean,
 The late past frosts tributes of pleasure bring.
 Grief melts away
 Like snow in May,
 As if there were no such cold thing.

" Who would have thought my shrivel'd heart
 Could have recovered greenness ? It was gone
 Quite under ground ; *as flowers depart*
To see their mother-root, when they have blown ;
 Where they together
 All the hard weather
 Dead to the world, keep house unknown.

"These are Thy wonders, Lord of power!
Killing and quickening, bringing down to hell,
And up to heaven in an houre;
Making a chiming of a passing bell.
We say amisse
This or that is;
Thy word is alle, if we could spell.

"Oh that I once past changing were,
Fast in Thy paradise, where no flower can wither!
Many a spring I shoot up fair,
Off'ring at heav'n, growing and groning thither:
Nor doth my flower
Want a spring-showre,
My sinnes and I joining together.

"But while I grow in a straight line;
Still upward bent, as if heav'n were mine own,
Thy anger comes, and I decline:
What frost to that? what pole is not the zone
Where all things burn,
When Thou dost turn,
And the least frown of Thine is shown?

"And now in age I bud again,
After so many deaths I live and write;
I once more smell the dew and rain,
And relish versing; O my onely light,
It cannot be
That I am he
On whom Thy tempests fell all night.

"These are Thy wonders, Lord of Love,
To make us see we are but flowers that glide,
Which when we once can finde and prove
Thou hast a garden for us, where to bide.
Who would be more
Swelling through store,
Forfeit their paradise by their pride."

We have marked a line or two of this, emphatically, as containing one of the most purely beautiful conceptions in the range of our poetic literature. We do not remember to have seen anything more descriptive of the emotion of the soul after some surprising deliverance, or on emerging from the shadow of a long-continued trial, than these artless lines:

"It cannot be
That I am he
On whom Thy tempests fell all night."

May they not also suggest to us the wondering rapture of the Christian on exchanging, instantaneously, (as it may seem to him,) the tribulation of earth for the secure felicity of heaven? It is not easy (at least in some moods) to read, with an unmoistened eye, another of these poems, beginning—

"Deare friend, sit down, the tale is long and sad."

It is a tale of purifying the "foul" heart in the font of "affliction."

"There it was dipt and died,
And washt, and wrung; the very wringing yet
Enforceth tears."

A tale of softening the "hard" heart in the boiling caldron of "affliction;" of stirring the "dull" heart by the thorns of "affliction." This is its close:

"Truly Friend,
For ought I heare, your Master shows to you
More favour than you wot of. Mark the end.
The Font did onely, what was old, renew;
The Cauldron suppld, what was grown too hard;
The Thorns did quicken, what was grown too dull;
All did but strive to mend, what you had marr'd.
Wherefore be cheer'd, and praise him to the full
Each day, each houre, each moment of the week,
Who fain would have you be, new, tender, quick."

One can hardly turn a leaf of this volume without being struck by some original and forcible expression of a familiar thought, or some sweetly insinuated word of comfort. We give a few of these scintillations from the burning heart of the saintly poet. They often flash with a seraphic fire—a glowing coal from God's own altar, so close to which this Christian priest continually ministered. Now it is like the prophet worshipping within sight of the moving doors and pillars of the temple pulsating with Jehovah's step; and now, the strain reminds us of that "Song of Songs" sung by the fairest of the daughters of Jerusalem to her Divine Lover. We touch but here and there a note.

"Whether I flie with angels, fall with dust,
Thy hands made both, and I am there,
Thy power and love, my love and trust
Make one place everywhere."

"Teach me Thy love to know;
That this new light, which now I see,
May both the work and workman show;
Then by a sunbeam I will climb to Thee."

"More servants wait on man
Than he'll take notice of: in every path
He treads down that which doth befriend him,
When sickness makes him pale and wan.
Oh mightie love! Man is one world and hath
Another to attend him."

"If souls be made of earthly mould
Let them love gold;
If born on high
Let them unto their kindred fly;
For they can never be at rest
Till they regain their ancient nest."

"Sweetest Saviour, if my soul
Were not worth the having,
Quickly then should I control
Any thought of waving:
But when all my care and pains
Cannot give the name of gains
To Thy wretch so full of stains,
What delight or hope remains?"

"What, (childe,) is the balance thine,
Thine the poise and measure,
If I say, Thou shalt be mine,
Finger not my treasure.
What the gains in having thee
Do amount to, only He
Who for man was sold can see,
That transferr'd th' accounts to me."

It remains only to notice Herbert's prose writings, for his Latin and Greek poems, elegant as they are in diction, are yet, to use the expression of Barnabas Oley, "dull and dead, in comparison of his Temple Poems, and no marvel. To write

those, he made his ink with water of Helicon ; but these inspirations prophetic were distilled from above ; in those are weak motions of Nature, in these raptures of Grace." Chief of these prose compositions is "A Priest to the Temple, or The Country Parson: His Character and Rule of Holy Life." This is a unique work. It is a minute picture of parochial labors, responsibilities, pleasures ; in essential points as timely now as two centuries ago. It must have been written from the every-day experience of its author, and may be read as a clerical autobiography: happy the pastor who can as truthfully record his own life-history among his people, in memorials like these. "The dignity" of the priesthood, he says in the opening chapter, "is in that a priest may do that which Christ did, and by his authority, and as his vicegerent. The duty, in that a priest is to do that which Christ did, and after his manner, both for doctrine and life." The conception of the sanctity of this office is penetrating and pervasive. It lifts the veil and goes within the holy of holies with the solemn tread of the old Hebrew hierarch. What a condemning and damaging contrast to the levity with which too many, in more than one among the churches, lay their hands on these sacred mysteries. And yet there is, as there should be, a chapter on "The Parson in Mirth," a short one indeed ; but long enough to remark that "he sometimes refresheth himself, as knowing that Nature will not bear everlasting droppings, and that pleasantness of disposition is a key to do good." Here is a basket of the mellow fruit laid up in this storehouse. In prayer, the parson's

"Voice is humble, his words treatable and slow ; yet not so slow neither as to let the fervency of the supplicant hang and die between speaking, but with a grave liveliness, between fear and zeal, pausing yet pressing, he performs his duty." "The pulpit is the parson's joy and throne." "The character of his sermon is holiness ; he is not witty, or learned, or eloquent, but holy." "The Parson's method in handling of a text consists of two parts: first, a plain and evident declaration of the meaning of the text ; and secondly, some choice observations drawn out of the whole text, as it lies entire and unbroken in the Scripture itself. This he thinks natural, and sweet, and grave. Whereas the other way of crumbling a text into small parts, as the person speaking or spoken to, the subject and object, and the like, hath neither in it sweetness, nor gravity, nor variety, since

the words apart are not Scripture, but a dictionary, and may be considered alike in all the Scripture." "His wife is either religious, or day and night he is winning her to it. Instead of the qualities of the world, he requires only three of her: first, a training up of her children and maids in the fear of God, with prayer and catechising, and all religious duties. Secondly, a curing and healing of all wounds and sores with her own hands; which skill either she brought with her, or he takes care she shall learn it of some religious neighbor. Thirdly, a providing for her family in such sort, as that neither they want a competent sustentation, nor her husband be brought into debt."

Though the second of these requisites be hardly looked for in our day, there are not wanting examples of its value as an adjunct to the clergyman's office, and not a few of our modern female accomplishments might profitably exchange places with the qualifications of a good nurse. It is recorded of the pious John Eliot, that having heard that a man, who had been his bitter enemy, was suffering from a severe wound, he caused him to be brought to his house, where his wife's surgical skill and Christian gentleness cured him both of his wound and of his enmity. But even more would we commend the Parson's "thirdly" to the thoughtful regard of our gentle secretaries of the treasury. Its final clause has a touching significance, and never more than now.

It is worth studying the language of Herbert with reference to contemporary authors, to note its singular advancement beyond the standard of the age. Spenser preceded him with the first three books of the "*Faërie Queen*" only about forty years; but that great poem needs a copious addenda of footnotes to interpret its obsolete words, while Herbert's pages, in their unaltered original dress, contain hardly any superannuated expressions. His diction is modern above that perhaps of any one who wrote at that period. Many of his prose works, possibly some of the best of them, have perished. Of the others which survived the burning of a friend's mansion, not long after their author's death, are "*Jacula Prudentium*," a collection of proverbs full of wisdom, a translation of an "*Italian Treatise of Temperance and Sobriety*," a few letters throbbing with the warmest of hearts, a "*University Oration*," and "*Preface and Notes to the Divine Considerations of a Spaniard*" — John Valdesso.

ARTICLE III.

THE SWORD AND CHRISTIANITY.

It is interesting to notice revolutions of thought which minds pass through, when cherished opinions are tried by unexpected ordeals of experience. Reasons of a very feeble strand hold a faith to ride out the easy swells of ordinary life; but when the tempest comes down, the virtues of tow are found to be not equal to the virtues of manilla. Opinions, then, for which one had been willing to endure a social martyrdom, are tossed to the winds, and the mind girds itself with new thoughts adequate to a day of storm.

In such a time no doctrines have vanished more pitifully under fierce trial, than those which have lashed minds with questions concerning human society out of joint. The social man is miserably sick; and the everlasting problem with humane thinkers has been, how to put him firmly on his legs again. Impatient at the slow promises of Christianity, mettlesome spirits have devised quicker methods of cure. There have been reform associations and peace societies; winsome quietings of the devil in man's heart by breathing in soft sentiments of a religion of the finer feelings; dainty persuasions about the beauties of society bound together in the proper adjustment of the affinities of love; or Olympian utterances, after the manner of that great Scotch catapult, flinging out ragged thoughts about the sublime achievements of mighty souls and the opening paths of grand action, in which all men may become heroes travelling towards Deity. But after human pride and impatience have slid the wisdom of Christianity into an asylum of the effete and worn out, and the ordeal of experience has come, then has the heavenly philosophy of Christ, like a mount of fire that blazes out only in times of earthquaking, shot up and drawn again the averted eyes.

Contemplating social peace from afar, the Gospel pursues it as an end by a system of making war. For reconstructing human society, its first work is to throw a new and fundamen-

tal discord into it. Divisions are split through families, between father and son, dividing brother and brother, separating household from household. Yet in these rendings which Christianity carries even to the hearthstone, the conflict is not one of simple passion. Thought is harnessed for the battle. Truth is girded for the strife. Opinions grapple in the contest. Faiths, like wrestlers, agonize for the mastery. Doctrines, as gladiators, strike the two-edged steel in the clash. And around this contest of thought with thought, this battling of opinions, there gathers often a storm of passion. The doctrines of Christ, coming down into the world and shoving right across old ways of thinking, arousing the mind and compelling it to stand on the defensive, must make strife. And that strife so organized on the one side with the vital principles of Jesus, principles that will not sleep nor suffer a peace with principles of wrong, is a peculiar glory of Christianity. No other system of thought, which has not at least stolen its vitality from the Christian religion, can make even a pretension to such a glory. Not till the doctrines of Jesus began to move upon the world, was there ever known such a thing as a great popular conflict of opinion. Conflict there was enough of it; interest with interest, pride with pride, passion with passion, scandal with scandal, duels of invective, wringing the ears of neighborhoods, moving persons to hate, communities to depredation, and peoples to war.

But the unique genius of Christianity throws into all that striving materials of thought, round which these fires of human nature gathering shall burn with nobler passions and purify themselves in burning. And that material is new doctrines of God and man, going abroad in society and energizing old doctrines.

The cavil of unreflecting scepticism is frequent, that certain truths or moral precepts, professed by the disciples of Christ, had been current thoughts of a pagan literature from time immemorial. "That great genial precept of social love and forbearance," we have heard it said, "is no discovery of the Gospel. Long before our Lord preached on the Mount, very many of his thoughts had been anticipated by other moralists. He taught, indeed, well; perhaps better than any one before

him ; he disclosed some new truths it may be ; yet much of his moral teaching was only the reproduction of old things in a new form. Even that golden rule which is so much shown around by his followers, as if it had struck a *placet* in the Gospel, is found just as well minted in the works of that great Chinese teacher." To which we answer, be it so. Even if such cavalier assertions were false, we would not be at great trouble to prove them false. False or true, the wisdom of Jesus shines with the same splendor. Always assuming that sufficient fingerposts had been set up in nature to guide the inquiring mind in ways of righteousness, Christianity has never plumed herself on discovering what man ought to have discovered, or on doing for man what he might be expected to do for himself. Claiming to reveal some things which man had never thought of, and some things which he could never have been sure of, she has brought that into the world which energizes all the new and all the dead old of religious truth. And, here, mounts up the true glory of the Christian religion as a moral power for turning society upside down. By her demonstration of God as the tender, loving, suffering Father of mankind, she has done that without which all human discovery in the field of morals, had been in the world what a flower-garden was in the field of Antietam, for turning aside the storm of war. She has taken the impotent precepts of morals and clothed them with power. She lays her hand on those shaky truths of human discovering, and behold ! they spring up clad in rattling mail. "Jesus Christ paraded stolen gems of truth !" Does that flippancy of mind ever think that those old truths were dead as the bones in the valley of Ezekiel, until the philosophy of a vicarious atonement breathed life into them and sent them forth upon the earth mailed for battle in the cause of humanity ? Yes, some of the truths of Christianity had already been old ; old as Bunyan's superannuated giant was old, crazy in the joints, shattered in the head, blind, toothless, and incoherently mumbling his anathemas to a laughing world.

From the beginning, then, the genius of the Gospel has been such as to carry strife among men. Moving with principles which would not sleep, nor allow principles of wrong

to sleep, a glory of the Christian religion is, that she compels error to stand on the defensive. And if that error be so firmly twined round the interests or passions of men as to gird them for the sacrifice, she welcomes the conflict even to the flow of blood in a shock of war. For, as the doctrines of the cross have trained its followers to think, war is not the greatest evil in the world. It is not the worst outbreaking of a depraved nature. Of the many evils consequent upon human depravity, war is one ; yet greater is a growing barbarism ; or a skulking ruffianism ; or the sacredness of moral sentiment lost to a people ; or the shame of dishonor written upon the life and breathing in the spirit of a people ; or a sordid imbecility cherished in the embraces and sinking down the manhood of a people to the degradation of ease and cowardice. The carnage of war is terrible. Yet a hundred times worse than the blood of battles is it, when a nation's spirit, swelling not with the pride of honor and manliness and with the grandeurs of right as outlasting the suffering years of earth, can rejoice in a peace stamped all over with the craven seal of a mean, money-making selfishness. And the only alternative of a people so perishing, is that of saving itself at the cost of blood. When those high in power are daring to talk treason with an unblushing brow in the very streets of a nation's capital, — studying the craft of bankrupting a treasury and then demanding the applause of half an empire for the villainy, and when newspapers, whose moving thoughts are at the ends of the land on the wings of evening, can dare, by a labored process, day after day, to figure out their own national government to be worth just a couple of shillings to each man, woman, and child ; then is a state sinking down surely in the decay of all that is great and worthy, unless it be taught the value of truth and patriotism in some hard way of suffering. Learning to think of the worth of country as measured in the balances with dollars and cents, with cotton and corn, a people is taking one long stride down to where *men* die out in a mercenary barbarism. The going down is easy ; but to turn back again, that's the rub. And so a religion whose Calvary has been teaching the world how infinite sufferings should be endured to save divine honor, points her finger often, at such a time,

to only one opening way of salvation, and that the gory path of war.

But the value of a battle for principle is far from being measured by the victory of it on the field where arms clash. In the culture of a nation's character the next best thing to a triumph of right, is the defeat of blood-stained right. The blood sanctifies the right. It seals it on the nation's heart "as with lead in a rock forever." It baptizes with a new power that old truth which Christianity has been teaching the world, that virtue is higher than happiness; that right can tolerate no comparison with comfort; that justice can be sacrificed not even at the price of torture.

Yet how sure is the tendency of a long and prosperous peace, to lift the comfort of man into an equality of value with principles of rectitude. Lounging on elliptical springs of idleness is a luxury which, once fully enjoyed by the slothfulness of physical nature, makes it agony to be disturbed, even by hunger knocking at the door. And what is true of a man resting on down, with nothing but his own selfishness to look after, is equally true of a nation at peace with all the world, and its thoughts absorbed in the fluctuations of gunny, pork, and leather. In the smooth gliding of prosperity, broken by no awful gulfs of yawning destruction, the character slides surely down where right and honor are easily sold for sensual enjoyment. This is the tendency. There are also counteracting tendencies. A people like the American would long drive, as the driving of Jehu, on the track of trade in a sweat for gain. But ultimately there would come the waving of a wand which must lay this activity to rest, as mesmerism is said to wave her subjects to an unresisting sleep. Luxurious living has a compensation fixed for it, only a few generations off, irrevocable as the laws of nature. And when that comes, physical ease and sensual enjoyment will have a value for an effeminate people, which can be measured by scarcely any considerations of truth and honor and right.

But Christianity, with the sword she brings into the world, meets this tendency of a selfish nature. By a system where suffering runs so largely into the machinery for working out man's salvation, she is telling us that for saving humanity the

value of comfort and peace is contemptible, in comparison with the value of pain and sorrow and woe. She points to the central fact of her history, and asks, "Where can one get so near Calvary as in suffering and dying for right?" That suffering affirms the unearthly value of right. In the name of Jesus, it declares principle to be so divine that its cost to a people that would save it, must be, sometimes, the shedding of blood. Offensive, though it be, in the nostrils of peace associations and of those benevolent souls who would save society by ramming it with pledges to reform, there has been nothing yet found among men like the smell of gunpowder, for making a nation perceive the fragrance of divinity in truth.

And here one, jealous of the honor of Christ, moving along with such thoughts as these, is thrilled with a profound feeling, as he views that sure process by which war in a Christian civilization exalts the ideal of national character. In a Christian civilization nearly all wars are waged in defence of, or, if not that, in recognition of, or, if not that, under the inspiration of, some great principle of morality. Perhaps the principle plays only an obscure part; or it is an unseen force that moves armies, as a warm spring day moves the winter torrents. Yet the moral result is the same. The great lesson taught is unvarying in its impression; that when dignity and honor and truth are in question, not even human life, with all its treasured affections, is worthy to stand one moment in competition. That clashing of steel, which closes about in defence of a national sentiment of right or of honor, is settling that sentiment in the heart and lodging it with the conscience for all time. Men talk of right as holier than life. Eloquence warms masses of mind into a passion with words about truth and the integrity of character as above all price. But when have minds learned to feel such language? Why should not the popular heart of England be as stolid under such appeals as the quicker sensibilities of the wily Persian? Only because England has been at school where these sentiments have written their worth on the heart in letters of blood. No people ever did, or ever could, feel the power of Christian principle growing up like an inspiration through the national manhood, until the worth of it had been thundered on the battle-field. What is the realized value of

any spiritual truth, until we see an adequate price paid for it? What is the felt grandeur of any conduct, until we see the sacrifices of it, in houses, or lands, or ease, or comfort, or blood? A world knew there would be a sublime nobleness in a refined delicacy coming down with attentions to soothe ugly forms of sorrow; yet a world waits to feel the nobleness of such sacrifice, until a Florence Nightingale is seen walking the halls of pollution and death. When the old martyr writhed out his life at the stake, telling to the last his love for Jesus, even a pagan mob might have entertained a suspicion that all their cruelties had not yet come up to the exchange value of his religion. More than the plagues of Egypt, more than Sinai, more than the cursing on Ebal, a Christ on the Cross has made the world feel that far above the value of any human sacrifice, is the honor of that righteousness which must be saved, though man be redeemed. That was a sacrifice which made real the worth of a principle. Just so a national manhood, with its moral dignity rising in transcendent glory as it rises in sacredness of honor, advances towards its full greatness only when marching at the head of armies, and stained with the blood of battles as the last defence of justice.

"A battle," says De Quincey, with a rare profoundness of thought, "is by possibility the grandest, and also the meanest, of human exploits." Rushing to arms for purely selfish or trivial ends, to gratify the rage of passions, to drink the emptiness of glory, or to beat round the ring of war in a struggle for brutal championship, can be only contemptible, for want of everything which gives dignity to human action. Such an ambition for war degrades every sentiment of true greatness. It sinks down a national character till a people, becoming too imbecile for self-protection, is useful only as a pretext over which other nations can shape their quarrels. Such is Spain at her present level, from being the first power in Europe. Such is Turkey, which, three hundred years ago, made the name of Solymán a dread from the Elbe to the Euphrates.

But the difference of spectacle is infinite when, at the call of a country in peril, armed legions, like Clan Alpine's warriors, spring up from brake and fell, and, in the might of moral wrath, the strength of the hills marches into a line that waits breath-

less for the battle to sound, in which manhood and honor and truth are to receive their terrible vindication. That is an exhibition, seen a few times in the history of nations, to be seen more frequently, it may be, as Christian truth shall inspire nationalities more, which transcends every other human effort in the grandeur of its character. Man, so inspired by sentiments of greatness to stand forth as a champion of his race, seems to lift himself out of our common humanity bound in sin and selfishness. He uncovers new capacities of being. Touching hidden strings of the soul, he liberates unsuspected chords of power. His nature mounts into a nobleness of action, like that seen when Milton's muse draws aside the veil and shows us war in heaven. Three times ten thousand men, led on by the great Adolphus in that thirty years' struggle for the rights of conscience, drawn up in battle array, their heads uncovered, their eyes lifted to heaven, their voices pouring out one volume of appeal to the God of armies in that song whose inspiration carried triumph over many a bloodstained field,

" Sure as God's own promise stands
Not earth nor hell with all their bands " —

where among the spectacles of earth can there be another so grand in moral character, so like what it must be when heaven goes to war?

But the lessons from a war carried on under the quickening of Christian truth, do not end with elevating the ideal of nationality. Their tendency is also to rectify and exalt the popular conception of God. Whatever be the drift in the education of public sentiment with respect to the sacredness of truth and right, exactly in a corresponding direction must be the growth of the popular idea of him who embodies truth and right. Just so exalted and holy and awful as are one's conceptions of love and justice, so correspondingly exalted and holy and awful will be one's conception of him in whom these dwell as attributes of being. And, on the other hand, when truth and honor come to have a market value with any people, the sure correlation is, that the people's God will come to have a market value also. That balancing of the sacrifice of suffering with the sacrifice of right, as if they might be interchangeable, as if a nation could justly sell its integrity in buying off

hard experiences, will surely degrade the old Hebrew's conception of that Being in whom were the foundations of truth, into the image of one whose imbecile sense of justice has not nerve enough to leave incorrigible sinners in the hands of his own divine laws. He comes to be a God of such boundless goodness, that he can only fold rebellious creatures in the arms of mercy, though they smite him unrelentingly in the face.

Different is the idea of God impressed on the mind when the army of Cromwell, gathered in their tents at the morning drum-beat, reading from the opened Bible of him who allots the destinies of nations, lifting their hands in prayer to the Ruler of battles, and pouring out their hearts in one of the grand old doxologies of a militant church; are up there, at the trumpet's call, to write in blood the name of Marston Moor on the conscience of England forever. So was it when Joshua led the hosts of Israel seven times around the walls of Jericho. So was it, when Miriam danced the triumph of the Lord on the shores of the Red Sea. The desolating tread of armies, marching in the cause of right and conscience, leaving homes laid in ashes, hearts broken, mangled dead, moans of dying, groaning hospitals, all a sacrifice which the Sovereign of nations uses as a last means for lifting human nature into a capability of life with him, is forcing the truth, even upon thoughtless minds, that fearful must be the infinite distance which lies between man and such a Sovereign. For even these are required to shock humanity out of its selfishness; to make it capable of heavenly fellowship; to impress it with the awful character of God.

Yet all such achievements of Christianity through her principles harnessed to the passions of men, are only strides towards a finishing work. Coming into the world and finding the spirit of strife restless on the earth, she proposes the divine task of entering into that strife, of kindling it into a fiercer flame, and of feeding the fire with her own truth, until human passions have burned themselves pure of the mean and selfish and dishonorable. The principles of the gospel entering as the inspiring element into the clash of war, it has become true,

"That God's most dreaded instrument,
In working out a pure intent,
Is man arrayed for mutual slaughter."

But the thought which Wordsworth does not mention as marking a divine genius in the method, is that Christianity using this terrible instrument to work out the noble purposes of God, will so destroy the instrument finally and forever. The end proposed is indeed far off. The process is hard and slow; for the slow and the hard are God's method. The steps which he has trod in the redemption of man, have been, scarcely one of them, taken except along a terrible way. Human kind, in the estimation of divine wisdom, is too far gone in wickedness to be saved by gentle means. Some diseases that prey upon the mortal life of man, can be arrested only by the severe appliances of medical science; bread poultices will not cure the bite of the cobra da capello. And so the Holy Spirit uses the surgery of divine science in saving human kind. Doctrines are announced to men, about which earthly passions gathering, and surging round and round in an increasing tumult, raise at last a storm that shakes all the elements of earth. Yet that storm carries salvation even in its ruin. It shocks into life a new conscience in men. Baptized with suffering and blood, this new conscience comes up slowly to sit in judgment on the conduct of kings and powers that study the art of making war. As Christian England may be supposed, by a fiction of faith, not to dare the opening of an unrighteous war, so the time will be, perhaps at a starry distance, when no Christian people will venture that which would bring down upon their selfishness, as if it were infernal, the execration of the conscience of a world. In the mean time a public sentiment, still rising purer through baptisms of fire, will be piercing with a keener search the actions of each Christian nation, as its policy of honor or of pride or of glory is unfolded to the judgment of all other nations. And, farther on in the work of redeeming man, when bloodshed has written all its terrific lessons of the majesty of truth, of the dignity of honor, of the sacredness of invisible principles, on the heart and conscience so as never to be forgotten, and the religion of Jesus, working through these, has changed the nature of man, then war and strife, and sorrow and sighing will flee away. A millennium of years may span the distance which lies between that time and ours; yet in the

sure wisdom of God, whose purposes unfold on the patient roll of centuries, all nations, ransomed of the Lord, shall come to Zion with songs of peace, and its everlasting joy upon their heads.

ARTICLE IV.

FASTING.

Nobody ever objects to fasting as a secular abstinence from food, for good reasons, unconnected with religion. If it will promote health, facilitate business, give lightness, freedom, vigor and rapidity to the intellectual operations, assist the orator to think well on his feet, or even aid the facile and animated delivery of a written address of any kind, it is conceded to be a good thing. The lawyer who has an argument to make in an important case, the merchant or banker who has complicated accounts to explore, the book-keeper casting figures, the political partisan who is reciting a stump speech in a circle of towns and counties before a great election, the lecturer who is earning his seventy-five, or hundred or hundred and fifty dollars per night, before popular audiences, does well to regard a fitting condition of body and brain. If one is travelling, fasting to gain time is approved. For reasons like these even a Christian may fast, it being understood he does not do it for religion! Nature has inserted a nightly fast between the last meal of each day and the first of the next, which is therefore called breakfast. After the effect of the food taken at supper has ceased in the system, we should always be annoyed with returning hunger, if the body were not receiving another sort of refreshment through sleep. Watchers by sick-beds and travellers upon railroads by night are aware of this, and "break" their "fast" before the hour of the morning meal. The unlearned in physiology think of some connection between this natural fast after midnight and the sleep which Nature gives us towards the small hours. It is only a religious fast of such duration in waking hours, for the repose or health of the soul which would be

objected to. Even a Christian minister is thought wise to fast sufficiently on the Sabbath to preach well; only if he should do the same to pray to purpose, or for any other help to his Christian experience, any day, he might be thought superstitious! and prone to forget that "every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving!"

The physical advantages of occasional fasting, in all climates, are conceded by all writers, except certain writers on religion, and by these in cases where the end is merely physical. "Abstinence from food in *eastern climes*," says one of these, "is more easy and less detrimental (if not in some cases positively useful) than keeping from food would be for us in these cold, damp northern regions." But Michaelis, who was by no means an Oriental, says that "alternation is the grand maxim of dietetics," a maxim which he applies to labor and recreation, but which applies to feeding and fasting as well. And a New England divine, still less an Oriental, and more evangelical than either, said the other day: "I believe it would do us Americans a great deal of good, both as Christians and as men, if we had a set of Sabbaths given for the stomach, and the more so now that the poor fagged organ has more hard work to do on our Sundays than at any other time. Besides, Nature has a way of getting her digestion-Sabbaths without consent of anybody; appointing every little while her day of headache, or cold, or colic, and so having gotten her rest by a kind of armed cessation, she lets us go on our way, a little more chastised, and probably a great deal less recruited than we should have been by a rational fasting." Even a Pharisee might practice such fasting and not be "practising a folly."

The Patriarchs before Moses' day seem not to have been aware of the physical uses of fasting, though Orientals. It makes its first appearance in the Bible as a purely religious thing.

Rising out of this natural view of the subject, there are also moral advantages from fasting to which no very strenuous objection will be made. Andrew Steinmetz says, in his "Personal Narrative of a Year among the English Jesuits," (The Novitiate," p. 212, note,) "Food is the main stimulant of the system; hence its withdrawal is beneficial in all acute diseases.

The passions may be termed acute diseases of the brain, when they riot in excess ; consequently fasting operates on the passions by the physical medium. Apoplexy, morbid affections of the stomach, derangements of the liver, many diseases of the heart, may be averted or subdued by well-directed fasting. Now many of the mind's diseases are sympathetically deduced from the morbid state of the respective organs diseased in the fore-mentioned cases. Thus the efficacy of fasting is manifest." As far as this on the score of what the "moral constitution" requires doubtless some would go in favor of fasting, who would draw back at once if it be suggested that any spiritual benefit is to be found in this form of keeping under the body and bringing it into subjection.

The objections made to fasting as a Christian practice, are, therefore, in their character and source, suspicious. They are of a self-indulgent and worldly cast. They are of the earth, earthly. They come from the carnal mind. They originate abundantly with those who are lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God. They violate all analogy, and in so doing, betray a cause and motive unspiritual. Why should that abstinence from fulness of food, which makes the reasoning powers acute, the fancy nimble, the wit quick and airy, the perceptions bright and strong ; which even redeems the moral powers from a gross and burdensome subjection to lower elements in us, utterly fail to be of service to the spiritual nature ? Or if it is of still higher service in religion than it is in health, mental work, and moral exercises, why should any object to it ? Why should we not expect to see a place for it in Christianity ?

If religious fasting, then, is not explicitly and expressly prohibited in the New Testament, no one has any right to discountenance it as a proper Christian regimen. Worldly men who think more of their regular meals than of greater and spiritual objects may, indeed, do so. But who beside ? If one is simply physically incapable of observing a religious fast, that is a sufficient reason for not doing so ; and such an one, in a sincere state of mind, will not argue against it on other grounds, unless mistaught. If there be spiritual profit, as the analogy of physical, intellectual, and moral profit from fasting argues, he will simply be sorry for being disabled therefrom. Still,

sickly persons *do* go without food for days together, often have to do so, in a country where all over-eat, as they do in this, and this shows that they *can*. Healthy persons can too. What shall we think, then, of the instant objection on the score of health, when the fast proposed is not for lower objects, but for religion? Unless Christ prohibits it, (its general usefulness on lower grounds being conceded,) who has a right to say a word against anything but its excess or abuse, which we should condemn as well if the object were not religion?

We have lately had a notable specimen of a certain style of assault on Christian fasting. On the morning of the Annual Fast for Colleges — the last Thursday in February — a popular “religious journal” contained the leader quoted in full below. It was the more offensive, and the more widely so, to Christian persons, because the “College Fast” is the only one observed simultaneously, in different States, by several denominations of Christians. It is still not kept as widely or as faithfully as is desirable, considering the magnitude of the interests it contemplates, especially in a crisis like this, when the number of youths under process of education has been so fearfully diminished by enlistments. It has been followed by untold blessings in years past; yet here the very principle on which it is observed is attempted to be trampled down.

“CHRIST’S DOCTRINE OF FASTING.

“The pharisees, when Christ was on earth, were greatly shocked that his disciples did not fast. To them this was one of the most essential and prominent of religious duties — so essential that they thought religion was impossible without it. They supposed that there was no way in which a man could attain or display so much holiness, or make himself so pleasing to God, as by abstaining from his ordinary food. It was not that they could see any real benefit to be derived from it; nor that fasting was the natural and spontaneous expression of any important feeling within them. They did not view it in this light. They thought only of the mere act of fasting; and this, in itself alone, they considered a religious work of the highest importance and value. So utterly distorted was their view of God, so entirely had they ceased to believe in his real goodness, so completely had they lost the idea of God as a Father, that they actually supposed it was a pleasure to him to see men impose privations upon themselves, and that to go without their daily bread was a sure means of commending themselves to his favor. A man might neglect the rules of morality, despise the publicans and sinners

who were made in the image of God as truly as himself, forget all the obligations of humanity, devour widows' houses, be full of covetousness, living only for himself — but all those iniquities might be covered up by depriving himself of his daily food — practising a folly to atone for a crime !

“To the pharisees, therefore, it was a matter of great astonishment that Jesus and his disciples pursued a course so widely different — that fasting was neither commanded by him nor practised by them. A few centuries later, they would have felt no such astonishment. For they would have found all pharisaic formalities and fastings reproduced, and even exceeded, in the Christian church — the religion of him whose disciples fasted not, and who imposed no fasts upon them, changed from its first simplicity into a multitude of rites and forms, feasts and fasts, which would have moved the envy of a pharisee, but which deserved, and still deserve, the ancient rebuke from God : ‘Who hath required this at your hands ? But in vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.’ But as Christianity was seen in the life of Christ and his disciples, feasts and fasts were unknown ; they were uncongenial with the spirit of his teachings ; and fasting, as a religious usage, was never practised by his followers while he was on earth. It was this which moved the wonder of the pharisees, and led them to inquire of him why he departed so widely from the customs and opinions of the time.

“The reply of Jesus to their question suggests the only true and proper idea of fasting — a natural, unforced, uncommanded expression of grief. There is no particular spiritual benefit to be gained, no religious instruction communicated, no impulse to duty given, by the mere act of fasting. There is no reason whatever for supposing that God takes pleasure in seeing men deprive themselves of their customary food, or that he regards them more favorably when they do this than when they eat with cheerfulness and gratitude that which he has given them. There is no piety in despising the gifts of God. Piety consists in doing what he has commanded, not in doing what he has not commanded ; in bearing with faith and patience the inconveniences and sufferings he sends upon us, not in inflicting needless inconvenience and suffering upon ourselves. Fasting, therefore, according to the teaching of Christ, is not an important religious duty ; it is not an essential part of religion at all ; it is so unessential that he has never enjoined it upon his disciples. It is not a church ordinance by any appointment of his ; and a church that requires fasting of its members as a religious duty, and lays it upon their consciences as a thing which they sin in neglecting, is usurping the prerogative of Christ, and thrusting itself presumptuously into his place. All that can be said for it, is that Christ has not forbidden fasting, provided men do not make a religion of it ; and that, in his answer to the question why his disciples did not fast, he puts it in its true light as a natural and spontaneous manifestation of sorrow. When the heart is bowed down under the burden of some heavy woe, outward things are forgotten ; even the wants of the body are unheeded ; and it is natural for men to ‘fast in those days.’ This Jesus does not disapprove ; this he says his disciples will do in the sorrow that shall fill their hearts when he is taken from their sight. Fast-

ing is proper in such a case, not because it is a religious duty, but because it is the natural expression of feeling, and is in harmony with the condition of the soul. But it is never proper when it is merely put on — when it is the appearance of a grief which is not felt — or when it is employed as a means of recommending ourselves to the favor of God.

“This is what Jesus assigns as the reason of the difference between his disciples and the pharisees. Those who followed him were in no mood for fasting. No grief was weighing them down; and for them to put on the appearance of a grief which they did not feel, would be a mockery — to do it as a religious service would be hypocrisy. ‘Can the children of the bride-chamber mourn as long as the bridegroom is with them?’ It is their time of gladness now. The bridegroom is with them; they have heard his voice; they have responded to his call; their hearts are filled with joy by his words of love; why, then, should they fast? how can they fast with any sincerity? This is the ground alone upon which Christ explains the conduct of his disciples. He does not apologize for them, as if they were neglecting a religious duty. He does not speak of their future fasting as if they would then be fulfilling a religious duty. He puts the whole matter — their future fasting, and their present neglect of it — simply on the ground of its agreement with their feelings at the time. Therefore he adds, ‘But the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast.’ The time was coming when he who had revealed himself to them as the King and Redeemer of men, whose words of heavenly grace they had heard so long, would leave them; and his departure would bring sorrow to their hearts; and when they saw him taken from them by violence, betrayed into the hands of his enemies by one of his chosen and trusted friends, marked, scourged, crucified — it would be natural that they should fast — that the deep anguish of their souls should overcome all sense of bodily wants, and make them forgetful even of daily food.

“This was Christ’s doctrine of fasting — misunderstood doubtless by those to whom he spoke; almost equally misapprehended for ages by those who were called his disciples; so that his church has needed — perhaps still needs — to hear from him those most suggestive words, ‘Go ye and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice’; and to accept for itself the reproof, ‘Ye have omitted the weightier matters of the law — justice, mercy, and faith.’” — *Independent*.

This is a pretty faithful echo of an article in “Kitto’s Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature,” by Rev. J. R. Beard, D. D., an English Unitarian. A more appropriate title would be “Man’s Doctrine of not Fasting.” So degrading a view of an accepted Christian usage, or one betokening a greater lack of understanding the Scriptures, is rare. It was replied to in the same journal, the succeeding week, by Rev. Horace Bushnell, D. D., in terms of marked surprise and just severity:

"It is not enough," writes Dr. B., "to say that I totally disagree with it; I think I know it to be unscriptural, and I believe it to be pernicious in sentiment. . . . These strictures I make, not because of the article merely to which they refer, but because I hear so many things in a similar strain, from our young ministers and our theological students here and there. We fancy that we are going deep, because we touch bottom where we are, when we happen to be in the shallows. This naturalism in which we are steeped shallows everything, and the pigmies and General Thumbs of grace have it for their wedding-day. We are ready to assume that pharisees and hypocrites are the only fasting men. Have there been no grand witnesses, heroes, mighty men, Titans of God, beside? A little deference to history ought to show us that grown people have lived, even if they live no longer."

An uninstructed reader of the editorial spread upon our pages above would gather from it that fasting originated with the pharisees. That is the obvious teaching, upon the surface. He would be surprised to learn that it was practised, sanctioned, and divinely commanded from two to a dozen or more centuries before this sect was heard of. The pharisees flourished a hundred and fifty years before Christ, (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii. 5, 9,) and doubtless originated some time before the days of the Maccabees. Dr. Beard refers their rise to the time of the return from the Babylonish captivity (Kitto, *Cycl. Art. Phar.*). But David, who will not be easily confounded with the pharisees, says: "I humbled my soul with fasting, and my prayer returned into my own bosom" (*Ps.* xxxv. 13); evidently making "religion of it"; and he was assailed by the irreligious for it; — "the reproaches of them that reproached thee are fallen upon me. When I wept and chastened my soul with fasting, that was to my reproach"; and it was not a slight abstinence he practised; "my knees are weak through fasting; and my flesh faileth of fatness." Other examples, purely religious, are 2 Chron. xx. 3; "And Jehoshaphat feared, and set himself to seek the Lord, and proclaimed a fast throughout all Judah"; and Ezra viii. 21; "Then I proclaimed a fast there at the river Ahava, that we might afflict ourselves before our God," &c. The one great Mosaic fast on the day of Atonement is ordained in Lev. xxiii. 27-29. This was established some fourteen hundred years before Christ. Dr. Beard gives it a heathen origin,

and regards it as "no new institution that the lawgiver was establishing, but merely an old and well-known practice, to which he gave a modified sanction." But when he comes to treat of feasts, the fact that feasting was an old and well-known heathen practice, is, in his view, no objection to its incorporation into the Mosaic institute.

Jeremiah and Daniel, the disciples of John, and Cornelius the centurion, are other examples of fasting as a religious exercise, *not* pharisaical, and divinely approved.

But one sort of fasting is commended above — from loss of appetite in trouble and sorrow. This is as great a blunder as ascribing its origin to the pharisees of later Jewish history. For others as well as Christians lose their appetites in such circumstances, and therefore such abstinence cannot be Christian, and a puerile allowance of it cannot be "Christ's doctrine of fasting." Moreover, as Dr. Bushnell shrewdly says, this "is not fasting, but simply revulsion from food. The very last thing which an afflicted man should do, is to fast, meaning anything by the term. He should rather constrain himself to eat what will sustain him." Besides, they knew all about this centuries before. When David's child by Bathsheba was very sick, he "went in, and fasted and lay all night upon the earth"; 2 Sam. xii. 16. What a vapid and pointless interpretation of Christ's doctrine to represent, with all the flourish above, that he reduced fasting to a mere "revulsion from food," as a "natural expression of feeling, in harmony with the condition of the soul," "a natural and spontaneous manifestation of sorrow," "the deep anguish of their souls overcoming all sense of bodily wants, and making them forgetful of daily food," when both saint and sinner knew all about this, as common unreligious experience, already!

Nor is the idea of fasting, as the unforced, uncommanded expression of some "important feeling," any more distinctively Christian. The greater number of the Jewish fasts on record were such; Esther's, and Mordecai's, and that of the Jews throughout the dominions of Ahasuerus, for example. Esther iv. 3, 16; ix. 31. It was on occasion, voluntary. National and religious feeling combined in it. That of Joshua and the elders after the defeat before Ai, (Joshua vii. 6,) is another example; that of

the twelve tribes, when they could not stand before Benjamin, (Judges xx. 26,) is another; that of Israel, at Mizpeh, when the Philistines pressed them, (1 Sam. vii. 6,) is another; that of the people of Jabesh-Gilead, (1 Sam. xxxi. 13,) is another; that of Israel after the death of Saul and Jonathan, (2 Sam. i. 12,) is another; that of Nehemiah, (Neh. i. 4,) is another; and that of Israel, (Neh. ix. 1,) is another. In the time of Joel we have an instance of a public fast, appropriate to a sad case, which the people had not religion enough to agree upon themselves, "required as a religious duty," by appointment of God, (Joel i. 14; ii. 12, 15). The fasts of evangelical protestants, private or public, are all voluntary; as much so as any other forms of self-denial or religious duty. Even the College Fast is not a church ordinance. If the Christian world should all agree to some annual fast, there would be no "usurping the prerogative of Christ." It would be spontaneous; but of conscience, which is the proper guide of Christians in these things, as of Old Testament saints, not of mere natural feeling, which is no guide at all. It would be on occasion, not from the absurd idea that going without food is meritorious, or the gifts of God to be despised.*

The pharisaical elements in some of the fasting of our Saviour's day are easily identified. They are two. The pharisees added many fasts to the one established by Moses. So common a book as "Coleman's Christian Antiquities" might have informed this writer of the fact.† And they made a display, a self-righteousness of the observance. The boast in the parable, (Luke xviii. 12,) "I fast twice in the week," discloses both these facts. But of Anna, the prophetess, it is said that she "departed not from the temple, but served God with fastings and prayers night and day," as a devout and accepted soul, to

* The miraculous fasts of Moses and Elijah are omitted here because they were miraculous. But do they not imply a *habit* of fasting, though other examples in the lives of these holy men are not of record? It is not without significance, that only the two Old Testament saints, whose fasts were as protracted as that of the Saviour in the wilderness, were with him on the Transfiguration Mount.

† The addition of other anniversary fast-days, to the original Mosaic usage, (viz: on the fourth, fifth, seventh, and tenth months, Zech. viii. 19,) seems to have come in contemporaneously with the rise of the pharisees. Jahn's Bibl. Ant. Lond. ed. p. 180. Pharisaism was thus historically an abuse of a usage which began long before, as it will long survive, the pharisees.

whom an expectation of the coming redemption had been imparted. Cornelius and Peter, too, seem to have been fasting about the same time — neither of them pharisees, nor observing any of the unauthorized fasts of the pharisees, nor observing the Mosaic fast or a private one, pharisaically. Fasting for many ends, and in a wrong spirit, of another kind, had, indeed, been already reprov'd in Old Testament times (Isaiah lviii. 3, 4; Jer. xiv. 12; Zech. vii. 5). Mere formalism in it had been forbidden (Joel ii. 13). What was distinctively, peculiarly pharisaical, was proud, public, self-righteous display. This, as a new abuse not known to the Old Testament, our Saviour forbade (Matt. vi. 16–18): “Moreover, when ye fast, be not as the hypocrites of a sad countenance; for they disfigure their faces, that they may appear unto men to fast. Verily, I say unto you, they have their reward. But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thine head, and wash thy face; that thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly.” And this was all he ever did forbid. The whole of “Christ’s doctrine of fasting” here relates to the manner in which a disciple should not, and the manner in which he should do it; not to attract attention, but with the outward man ordered as at other times.

We are now prepared to estimate the astonishing superficialness, if it be not biblical ignorance, of some of the statements quoted above. “All that can be said for it, is that Christ has not forbidden fasting, provided men do not make a religion of it.” May they make, then, a worldliness, an irreligion of it? — as they do a physical, intellectual, and merely moral regimen. And Christ approves of it only if it is not a religious usage — he who approved of anything only as it was religious! And this is all that can be said for it — not forbidden, if only it is not religious — when he has directed his disciples how to practise it as religious! “*When ye fast.*” * “Fasting as a re-

* It is here that His “doctrine” on the subject is to be found — Matt. vi. 16, 18; not in Matt. ix. 14 — a doctrine for present practice, enjoining only what was needful; a Christian method of practising an immemorial duty. In chap. ix. 14, there is no doctrine whatever, only a prediction of future practice in one particular. To find all his doctrine where there is none, is as great a mistake as to use the words of Hosea vi. 6, quoted by Christ Matt. ix. 13, uttered in respect to Levitical sacrifices offered without the spirit of religion, to discredit fasting as a religious usage.

ligious usage was never practised by his followers while he was on earth. It is not asserted that *he* did not fast. His forty days in the wilderness stand in the way. Doubtless, too, in his absences from them for prayer he fasted for briefer periods. But did they eat their food as usual when

“ Cold mountains and the midnight air
Witnessed the fervor of His prayer ? ”

Not to say that as he had not where to lay his head, so he had not where to obtain his food often, (and so they) ; could they have sympathized with him so little in his voluntary religious fasts as not to practise the same ? Why did he tell them how to fast if they were “ never to practise it ? ” He told them at the same time how to pray ; were they never to pray ? “ But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet.” “ But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thy head.” The words are almost a demonstration. Moreover, “ thy Father which seeth in secret,” *i. e.*, sees thy fasting, “ shall reward thee openly.” How could the Father see fasting which was not practised ? These directions were given at the beginning of his ministry, when his disciples were few. And Peter was one of them, whom we find fasting afterwards. They were given before he was inquired of why they did not fast, and their observance of them was the occasion of the inquiry. When they fasted they did not appear to be doing so, to men ; their anointed heads and washen faces made it a secret religious usage, as their Master intended. Therefore, supposing they did not fast at all, — because it was not in the protracted and observable way — they made inquiry of him, why ? He gave as a reason (Matt. ix. 14) their joy at his presence ; not denying, still, that brief, occasional fasts were practised by them, even then, in the secret way he had required. And this inquiry was not made by the pharisees, as stated above, but by the disciples of John ; the disciples of the pharisees (more ingenuous, doubtless, than their masters) accompanying them. Matthew mentions only the disciples of John ; Mark and Luke those of the pharisees also ; naming those of John first, thus all three showing that the question originated with those of John : (Matt. ix. 14 ; Mark ii. 18 ; Luke v. 33.) The declaration of Christ, too, that a

certain species of demons could only be cast out by prayer and fasting, (Matt. xvii. 21; Mark ix. 29,) implies that he practised fasting himself, so being always in a condition to cast out the most violent deaf and dumb spirit; and that he would have his disciples do the same.*

It is implied in what is said above of the departure from gospel simplicity "a few centuries later," and the reproduction of "all pharisaic formalities and fastings," that in the first centuries Christians did not fast. This is as wide of the facts as other statements. And so common an authority as Mosheim is sufficient to confute it. He says of the first century; "the custom obtained that most Christians occasionally and privately joined abstinence from their food with their prayers; and especially when engaged in undertakings of great importance. Of any solemn public fasts, except only on the anniversary day of the crucifixion of Christ, there is no mention. Gradually, however, days of fasting were introduced." He admits that there is some force, however, in the arguments of those who hold that the fourth and sixth days of the week were so observed "while the apostles were still living." For apostolic fasting, on occasion, no day being fixed, there is yet better authority than this. Paul speaks of himself (2 Cor. xi. 27) as "in fastings often"; and if these are to be regarded as merely compulsory sufferings — like his stripes and perils and watchings — we can hardly so regard the similar statement in chap. vi. 5, where he is reciting the things by which he approved himself as a minister of God. Many of these things are voluntary — labors, long-suffering, love, &c. One instance of his fasting occurred at Antioch, where other prophets and teachers fasted with him, and where he and Barnabas were set apart to their mission with fasting and prayer. On this mission he and Barnabas ordained elders in every church with prayer and fasting. (Acts xiii. 2, 3; xiv. 23.) Surely this was in the first century. And in his perilous voyage in the Mediterranean he obtained, after prayer and fasting, assurance of the deliverance of the ship's company from the wreck; and, not having fasted himself from fear of

* Dr. Beard says of this, in Kitto: "It would appear that the practice was considered, in the days of Christ, to act, in certain special cases, as an exorcism." Think of our Saviour sanctioning an exorcism!

drowning, or from the mere "burden of some heavy woe," after the sailors had fasted fourteen days, being so frightened and anxious they could not eat — he obliged them to take meat for their health: (Acts xxvii. 21, 33, 34.) Some difference there between the apostle's fasting "as a religious exercise," and that of the sailors as "a natural expression of feeling!" Moreover, he enjoined fasting in a given case upon the Corinthians as an adjunct to prayer — both religious, — 2 Cor. vi. 5.

What becomes now of the strange statements on which we have commented? What need of an express command to make fasting, on occasion, and with great spiritual objects before us, a Christian duty, as it has always been a Christian practice? How plain that our Saviour intended to forbid the abuse of it, leaving its use untouched. How mistaken those who suppose it was "done away by Christ." When the Mosaic economy fell, it left this, like prayer and alms-giving and other religious duties, standing. It has an unchangeable relation to spirituality, unworldliness, elevated and fervent conceptions of divine things, a just estimate of the importance of unseen and eternal objects, and prevalency in prayer. What that relation is, it is not the design of this paper to state.

ARTICLE V.

CHRIST'S TESTIMONY TO OUR CANONICAL SCRIPTURES.

The Testimony of Christ to Christianity. By PETER BAYNE, A. M., Author of the "Christian Life," &c., &c. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1862.

A NOTICEABLE fact in the religious drift of the times is the deification, not of the nature and person of Christ, but of his teachings. A divine wisdom is conceded to him by those who deny his proper deity. He was confessedly so filled with the Spirit of God as to be a safe and sufficient interpreter to man of

spiritual truth and duty. The words of Jesus are acknowledged to be authoritative. Without caring to study the question of his proper dignity of being, these persons allow that his understanding and affections habitually dwelt too near the central fount of light and love, to permit him to err materially as a moral instructor of the world. "Never man spake as this man," is not with them a mere flourish of complimentary rhetoric. They would have everybody sit at his feet, like Mary, to hear the sublime and gracious utterances of his lips.

This laudation, however, of Christ's precepts is not seldom found in company with several quite contrary sentiments. It often takes pains to express its disbelief in the supernatural features of revelation. It discards all miraculous helps and vouchers of the Christian dispensation. It professes a marked distrust of both the earlier and the later inspiration of the Scriptures. They, who thus put honor upon the discourses of Jesus in the evangelists, have small respect for the predecessors or successors of his earthly ministry. From Moses to Malachi, with the exception of a few of the selectest ethical and devotional passages, is a track of literature which they travel, if at all, with hardly more interest of any kind than they would read the theology of Hesiod or the histories of Herodotus. It is not to them a Bible in any superhuman sense. Nor are the apostolic writings. These may come more nearly to it, inasmuch as their authors had the advantage of a more modern age of intellectual culture than fell to the lot of those Hebrew herdsmen and warriors. Paul and Peter, therefore, could tell more truth than David and Jeremiah; just as ordinarily a man can see more distinctly at nine o'clock of the morning, than at four or five. But most of the apostles were illiterate Jews; and he of Tarsus, if not this, was bound up in inveterate narrow prejudices and nationality. Consequently, their epistles cannot surely be taken as the text-books of our faith. Recite to us, say they, what Jesus spoke, and we will listen with reverence as to a voice from heaven. But the world has had many nobler, wiser, more godlike sages and seers to give it doctrines for the soul, than the best of those antiquated Israelites.

This kind of speculation is fashionable and easy; but it is neither fashionable nor easy to answer the strictures to which it

validly and unanswerably lays itself open. We have already made a reference to the conclusive exposure of its unsoundness by Mr. Peter Bayne, in a brief notice of the volume prefixed to this article, so far as it relates to the miraculous features of the sacred books. It is impossible to divide between Christ's general statements of religious doctrine and precept, and his clear avowal of the reality of the miracles which attested his own mission to earth. This one citation, with which Mr. Bayne prefixes his work, contains within itself the simple but complete demonstration. "Jesus answered and said unto them, Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see ; the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk ; the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear ; the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them. And blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me." These are the words of this Great Teacher, affirming what ? A falsehood ? That acts of this description were wrought which never took place ? that dead men lived, and blind men saw, and lame men walked, at his command, who never lived, and saw, and walked ? Then the impostor, who could so falsify the truth, is not worthy of credence in any of his teachings. Should he utter truth and wisdom, it would not deserve our regard because of, but in spite of, his repeating it. Persons who thus compliment our Lord's discourses, but reject his self-authenticated deeds of supernatural power, certainly do not compliment their own logical perceptions. They are willing to take a gospel from hands quite too unclean, upon their theory, for our acceptance.

We do not intend to dwell longer upon this palpable inconsistency. If any one would pursue the subject further in this special direction, we would again commend to his study the book just indicated. Our purpose at present is different yet congenial. We join common ground with these concessions of the divine excellence and authority of Christ's words, and will see to what conclusions this will fairly lead us with regard to the associated Scriptures of this revelation, which we hold to be also from God, and to give us, in their entirety, the Christian religion : a subject to which the strictures of Davidson and Colenso upon the canon of Scripture are giving a fresh importance.

§ 1. Christ was in the constant habit of referring to the former biblical writers as entitled to an equal regard with himself. Matthew v. 17-19 is a conclusive citation, in which he distinctly asserts that he did not come on any such abrogating errand as is ascribed to him. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfil." This language signifies: 'I purpose to repeal nothing, to interrupt nothing, which your sacred books have laid down as of spiritual force and obligation, the belief and expectation of which they have authorized.' Christ had the same Old Testament which we have. Its common title was — 'The Law and the Prophets.' If he had said in so many words; 'I am not come to destroy your Bible, but to fulfil it' — he would not have spoken any more plainly to a Jew.

"*Νόμος καὶ προφηταὶ* denotes, in the Jewish *usus loquendi*, the whole compass of the written word, together with all the institutions which reposed upon it. . . . This compendious designation was so much the more proper, as in fact *Law* and *Prophecy* constituted the real component parts of the Old Testament economy; the law awakening the feeling of a want of salvation; the prophets intimating that that want should one day be supplied." *

Christ's language looks backward and forward. He indorses the past and assures the future. He verily declares that these ancient Scriptures shall lose not "one jot or one tittle" of their official weight, till heaven and earth pass away. And, further, that it shall forever be deemed a serious offence against religious truth to undervalue, to teach men to break, one of the least of their commandments. A sensitive jealousy is here manifested for the integrity, the inviolability of God's previous revelations to that people. Christianity was to expand, to perfect them, morally, by a more interior understanding and practice of the law of holiness: virtually, by the self-sacrifice of Christ, and through him, of the church, to God, as a living oblation: prophetically, in the final triumphs of the kingdom of grace among men.*

References by our Lord are also frequent to the same writings in illustration and enforcement of his various discourses, as to the histories of Noah, David, Sodom, Jonah, Solomon.

* Vide "Tholuck's Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount." Vol. I. *in loco*.

He thus accepted and handed onward the religious lessons connected therewith. He stamped them as good coin with his own image and superscription. With this it must be kept in mind, that to the Hebrews these documents were in the highest sense holy — the inspired gift of God to their fathers. Now Christ, a religious teacher, takes these sacred books, and makes them the text-book of his reasonings, arguments, appeals, in expounding the most central and vital doctrines of God and the spiritual life to that nation, and, through these evangelical records of those teachings — to us. How is it possible that he could more positively reordain these earlier writings to the work of permanently preaching the will of God to men; how install them more firmly in human confidence, than by this use himself of their contents?

§ 2. Christ was accustomed to rely very much upon these former Scriptures for the proof of his own claims as a teacher sent from God. He was ever alluding to the fulfilment, in his own person, of their descriptions and anticipations of the Messiah. But what could such citations be worth in an argument like this, had these very sources of evidence no divine authority? It would only have been quoting one fiction to prop up another. It will not do to say that, as the Jews thought their canon to be the word of God, Christ innocently availed himself of that national prejudice to establish his Messiahship. That would not have been innocent. Nor are we now dealing with sceptics who hold that Jesus was a trickster; but with those who yield the point that what he said and taught is worthy of general acceptance. Consequently, he must have used no false devices, must have made no fictitious issues, must have cited no sham authorities. Let us look at this with some carefulness.

“The Son of Man goeth, as it is written of him.” “For it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad.” Christ here calls to his aid marked allusions to his divine office in the Psalms, and by the prophets Isaiah and Daniel. The following is more comprehensive. “And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself. And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake

unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their understandings, that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer." Luke 24. The scope of this quotation renders it needless to show, as could be easily done, that hardly an Old Testament writer has been passed by unused in the conversations of our Lord. The question, therefore, comes again upon us; what is the value of these references as a matter of inspired, religious authority? what character does Christ's treatment of those ancient records demand for them under the circumstances of the case?

Bear in mind, that in our Lord's day, the Hebrew canon was collected and embodied, as we have it; that, moreover, it had been translated into Greek by learned Alexandrine Jews. When Jesus therefore spoke of it, he spoke of it as a whole, just as Christians now speak of the Bible, without intending in any way to abridge its volume. They called that book their word of the Lord, as we call the two Testaments ours. So Christ used that first instalment of revelation to certify his mission from Heaven. He did not quote it, as a body of Hebrew literature, to illustrate points of historical, scientific, or æsthetic controversy. He always had a spiritual purpose in his appeals to its pages. He taught from it the doctrine of God and man, holiness, sin, redemption, repentance, and his own fulfilment of its wondrous types and predictions. Jesus Christ revered those earlier servants of God as revealers of the true faith. Their Jehovah was not to him, as to some of his extant pretended ministers, a monster of cruelty and animal passions, unworthy of the respect of a liberally educated worshipper — only another Joye or Vishnu with a Mosaic name. Its holy law was not to him a superannuated bondage. Its fundamental idea was not a rude provincialism. It had the capacity of a world-wide expansion. A seed was within that hard shell which only waited its bursting, to grow and fill the earth. Christ taught his generation to study and obey their Bible. "Search the Scriptures; for . . . they are they which testify of me." Read the previous verse: "Ye have not his word

abiding in you" — the Father's. That is ; these Scriptures of yours are that Father's word : you accept them as such, and look for eternal life through their directions ; but though they are full of me, you believe not on him of whom they so clearly testify. Our argument here is irrefragable. No Christian now ascribes a higher divine authority, in faith or practice, to the entire Bible than Christ did to the Bible of the Jews. His teachings are allowed to be true and reliable. Then, by his indorsement, the Old Testament, as he received it, and enjoined it on his generation, demands our religious confidence, if we mean anything by our acceptance of his instructions.

In all this citation and indorsement of that body of Scripture, by our Lord, we find no hint of the mass of numerical and historical error embedded within it, which our modern detectives are so singularly sagacious in bringing to the surface. Did not Christ know the facts ? Or knowing them, did he dishonestly conceal them ? Either supposition is fatal to any true faith in him as our prophet, priest, and king. A Christian bishop could hardly take the *last* of these positions ; that he should be driven to the *first*, shows the desperate exigencies of his argument.

§ 3. Christ did most explicitly endow his apostles with the same authority, as religious teachers, which he claimed for himself. We shall here show, that no one, who pretends to respect his words, can consistently set theirs aside, under the pledges made to them, by himself, of unerring guidance, as interpreters of Christian truth. Not less than this can be included in these texts : "And Jesus spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations . . . to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you ; and lo, I am with you alway." "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." Those who limit our Lord's office to the work of a religious educator, should not, on the face of these declarations, deny to his disciples, thus taught and commissioned, an equal credence. Again : "It is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." "For the Holy Ghost shall teach you, in the same hour, what ye ought to say." This proves that some of the apostolic words are directly the "word of God." Then, which ? "It behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the

third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of all these things. And behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." Which means; ye are the appointed preachers and expounders of the Christian doctrine to all coming ages; and the communicated wisdom of God shall prepare you to execute this high trust with all authority as the accredited agents of myself and my Father. "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that heareth me, heareth him that sent me." The inspiration is one and indivisible. "When he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth, . . . and he will show you things to come, . . . for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you." A copartnership of spiritual knowledge is here displayed, ample and confidential enough to establish the truthfulness of the apostolic writings to any mind which really believes in Christ's veracity. "The Holy Ghost shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you."

This was the safe-conduct of the apostles in carrying onward the ministry of Jesus Christ with an authority equal to his own; and to transmit to posterity the written memoirs of their Master's life, as well as their own letters to the churches, and the histories of their labors in evangelizing the nations. Thus furnished by the spirit of Christ to speak in his name, it is directly within the field of our survey to notice —

§ 4. What these men said upon the points involved in this investigation. This furnishes an integral part of the testimony of our Lord to his own religious system. What said they

(a) With reference to themselves? They claimed the guidance of that divine presence and influence which had been pledged to them. In writing to the church at Antioch the first minutes of a Christian council, they took the ground unhesitatingly: "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." They said: "Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our

epistle." The inspiration of their minds was not then only to speak orally to men, but equally to write instructions for human direction. "The dispensation of the grace of God . . . is given me to you-ward; How that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery, as I wrote afore in few words; Whereby when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ." Yet again: "Our beloved brother Paul, also, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you; as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction." This is a noteworthy passage. It affirms, under sanction of God's truthful Spirit, the inspired character of Paul's epistles, and classes them by name with "the other Scriptures." It is the declaration of one, to whom Christ personally pledged an unerring guidance as a religious teacher, that those epistles are a portion of the Christian's Bible. It is virtually the testimony of our Lord himself to that fact. But what have these men, thus protected from error, told us

(b) Concerning the earlier canon of God's word? We have seen how their Master underwrote its divine authority: what did his disciples publish respecting it?

To this it might be answered, that several entire epistles are little more than a commentary on important portions of the Old Testament, from the Christian point of view. Thus in Romans we have the restatement of the leading points of the Adamic and Abrahamic narratives, with a careful treatment of the spirit and bearings of the Jewish ecclesiasticism with respect to the work of Christ. This is variously repeated in the letters to the Corinthians and Galatians; and in that to the Hebrews the author gives us an elaborate dissertation upon the Mosaic economy, with the fullest certification of the biblical genuineness of the books which contain its institutions. So have we frequent citations of special events and sentiments; as in 1 Cor. 10—where, after reciting certain facts concerning Israel's leaving Egypt and trials in the desert, the apostle adds: "Now all these things . . . are written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come." Compare, also, with what has

been said respecting the Jewish canonical writings, the following assertions of their religious authority: "From a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." What shall we say now of the unprofitableness, to our Christianity, of the institutes of an older worship, the teachings of a less illumined age? If 'holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,' and thus recorded truth which availed to sanctify the primitive believers, and to fit them for their heroic works of love and endurance, is it altogether certain that we have outgrown the capability of being strengthened in holiness by the same spiritual nutriment?

Bringing the heads of the argument thus far followed into a single line, they stand thus. Starting from the common admission of the truthfulness and trustworthiness of Jesus Christ, as a divinely accredited teacher of religion, we have these points of his testimony: (1.) He directly accepted and confirmed the canon of the Old Testament as the word of God. (2.) He habitually appealed to it, in proof of the validity of his claims to the Messiahship — as a recognized, divine revelation. (3.) He promised to his apostles full powers of inspiration, through the Holy Ghost, as the appointed expounders of Christian faith and obedience, to the end of time. (4.) They, thus endowed and accredited, asserted the authority, as from God, of their written as well as spoken words, and also of the Scriptures of the earlier canon. The concession, therefore, of Christ's teaching as religiously binding upon us, carries with it logically the divine character and claims of both the Old and New Testaments.

Several thoughts have suggested themselves in the progress of this discussion, which we will gather into a few concluding pages. One is —

That the human mind is not of itself competent to decide directly what a revelation from God should contain.

Clearly this is so, because we have detected it in the act of rejecting much which is proved to be an essential part of that revelation. Men standing merely on the earth's surface are not high enough to determine what a Bible for all times and races should be. To compose and arrange its materials demands an eye which can look from before "the beginning," down the entire vista of projected moral government over rational beings. One may sketch some single object, or narrow landscape, from a moderate hilltop, or the level ground. But coast-surveys require the highest elevations for the theodolite. God alone occupies a station sufficiently above all things to take into one glance the wants of the race as involved in a revelation of himself. Man sees here and there a subject which he confesses needs illumination from God. He gathers up, from a fragmentary and disjointed induction, his notion of a moral guide-book for the community. And these notions are endlessly variant and contradictory. God's induction, or, rather, intuition, on the other hand, is complete, perfect. This volume is its fruit. Christ discovered his divine nature in nothing more plainly than in grasping the real, the permanent spirit of the already current Scriptures, and showing, in so masterly a method, their perpetually authoritative hold on human reverence and obedience. Every word of God is true, and truth's substance is eternal. But what truths are to stand forever as man's religious monitor, whether in the shape of history, statute-law, devout meditation, poetic effusion, didactic address, parable, or familiar letter to churches or individuals — this is quite beyond the range of human dictation. Our responsibility here reaches only to a fair and earnest inquiry for the legitimate and sufficient evidences of a revelation from God; not to a critical digest of what that revelation must or must not contain.

It confers no honor on Christ to exalt his words as worthy of respect, to the undervaluing and setting aside of the rest of the Bible. It is rather an insult to him, as is easily seen. What is done is not a reverent acceptance of his teachings at all. It is the assumption of the right of saying which of *his* words shall be received and which thrown out. His indorsements, so full and frequent, of the Old Testament writings are

as much a part of his discoursings as are any of his instructions. But these are not to be credited, we are told, any more than what a Moses or a Paul may have uttered. That is—Christ himself must also be brought to the bar of this criticism, that it may there be settled what of his words are Gospel and what is not. So that even the Son of God is treated scarcely more respectfully than are mere human prophets and apostles. This shows us—

The folly of attempting to divide that which is naturally indivisible. The Bible is so. It is one revelation, woven together with a wondrous variety of texture and hue, but with a yet more wondrous unity of design and execution. It is a Titanic arch, built upward from each side with precious marbles of divers qualities and veinings, from heaven's own quarries, culminating far up on high in glorious symmetry and strength, where Christ, the keystone, locks the massive structure in eternal rest, and crowns it with divinest grace. It cannot be tampered with. It is incapable of reconstruction. It cannot be built down to a smaller model. To attempt this is to tumble it into a mass of ruins. See where it ends. A self-conceited superiority of spiritual insight decides that Moses is too old, that Samuel, David, Isaiah, are too provincial, to teach the nineteenth century God's will; that Paul, and Peter, and John were competent for nothing higher than to report what Jesus may have spoken for human enlightenment, but could lay no claim that is valid to our credence as guides to salvation. We look to our Bible, then, and find its goodly volume reduced to a few chapters of Christ's much-praised sentences. These indeed are "spirit and life." But as these words are studied, they are found to embrace the most direct statements of the lasting validity of the Old Testament; and prospectively announce the divine legation of the apostles to teach mankind the loftiest, most interior truths. What now must be done? Believe Christ and accept his vouching of his forerunners' and his followers' inspiration? Not at all; but divide Christ, too, as the rest of the Bible has been rent asunder; cut his seamless coat in pieces; take some of his words and label them God's truth; take others just as authentic, and mark them supersti-

tion, ignorance, falsehood. Do we over-state? Wise men can answer.

A true sympathy with Christ will receive all his teachings, and with them the unabridged, unmutated word of God. It feels submissively the force of his interrogation to the unbelieving Jews: "And if I say the truth, why do ye not believe me?" It bows to his solemn declaration as final: "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice." It cannot spare any part of that holy book which he loved to read, to ponder, as his Father's word, when a man like us. Did these venerable pages minister to his human comfort and development? That were enough to endear them forever to our hearts, if we are his friends. If he needed their succors, so do we. If he honored their agency as an aid to man's education and salvation, so should we. Did his apostles nourish and guide the churches by knowledge of spiritual things derived from their ascended Lord? Then they must be our counsellors as well, if we would not endanger the separation of our souls, our life, from the common centre of life. A genuine religious tendency never wished to make the Bible shorter or smaller than Christ made it. Rather would it that more of those disclosures of truth and duty and Christian experience might have been recorded, so that it could yet more rejoice in finding greater spoil. What gain to our mental as well as moral culture would it be, if thousands of shelves-full of our current literature were emptied to make room for the inspired narrative of those "many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written." But the canon is closed and sealed. It cannot be strange that they should guard it with sleepless watch, who hear the voice of this same Chief Witness saying of it *all*, not less than of its closing section: "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." He who testifieth thus is the *Lord Jesus*; and he cometh quickly.

ARTICLE VI.

OUR LORD'S THIRD TEMPTATION.

THOUGH all revealed truth is precious to the Church, there are times when it turns with peculiar interest to certain portions of it. During the last fifty years, the doctrine of the Deity of Christ has necessarily held a leading place in its thoughts and discussions. Those who have defended it have also held firmly to his proper humanity, but they have naturally if not necessarily given to this side of the truth less prominence than belongs to it in a perfectly balanced system. There are indications that this neglect is being felt and that Christian experience is turning with new longing to the human sympathies of its divine Lord. With these we are brought into close contact in considering his Temptations.

When the apostle would urge us to confidence in approaching the throne of grace, he sets before us the fact that our intercessor there can sympathize with us, inasmuch as he has been tempted as we are. If this could not be said, the chief thing would be wanting to assure us that his nature was really one with ours.

In examining this subject, the thing of chief importance is to ascertain the facts which the Scriptures set forth concerning the temptations of our Lord, while the theories by which these are explained are of minor consequence. In our last number, we gave a general view of this passage in our Lord's history. We recur to it again, to present, with as little repetition as possible, some additional thoughts and inquiries. That it was real there can be no doubt. It is not enough either to justify the language of the inspired narrative, or to satisfy our wants, to suppose that some unusual vision passed before him representing a temptation. It must have been an actual trial of his virtue — of his obedience to the divine will. His obedience is made an essential part of his work as mediator; but nowhere except in the closing scenes of his life was his obedience more conspicuous than in his temptations. Though we may suppose him to have met with these all through his earthly life, yet the only

account which we have of his being tempted is that which describes the assaults of the devil upon him in the wilderness.

In coming to a circumstantial examination of that account, we must first decide, what is essential to temptation. To this we answer, there must be an appeal to a desire in itself right, but which, in the circumstances, it would be wrong to gratify; and, a probability of obtaining the object desired by wrong doing. This last point is too evident to need argument. That which there is no probability of obtaining cannot be a motive to action. But if, with the probability of obtaining the desired object, an appeal is made to a desire in itself right, but which, in the circumstances, it would be wrong to yield to, we have all that is essential to temptation. This, it is true, is not all that is generally implied in it, in the case of sinful beings, for there is usually, if not always, some degree of *wrong* desire awakened. But that is not essential to the idea of temptation. To illustrate: it is not wrong for a hungry man to desire food. But this right desire may be the occasion of his being tempted. In the extremity of his hunger, he may see a neighbor pass by with a loaf of bread which he knows he can gain possession of only by theft. The desire for bread, for that bread, is a lawful desire, but the least desire to get it in such a way would be sinful. The knowledge that it can be so obtained constitutes the temptation to the crime.

But suppose him to be so perfectly virtuous that the temptation does not for an instant awaken the least desire to yield to it. Virtue is so settled a habit of his mind that he shrinks from the sin by which alone the bread can be obtained as an evil vastly greater than any suffering which he can endure from the want of it. So not a breath of wrong desire moves in his soul. He does not repine because he cannot or dare not sin. Rather it is a joy to him to repel at once the temptation and to choose and abide by the right. There is no sin in such a case. It implies no wrong that he is tempted. Instead, there is virtue of a higher kind than if he had not been subjected to this trial of his constancy.

Such was the temptation of our Saviour. He had human appetites and human desires, so far as they can exist without sin. He was subject to hunger and fatigue. Food was pleas-

ant to him when hungry and rest when weary. He had human affections and was susceptible of human joys and sorrows, of pleasure and aversion, of hope and fear and anxiety as we are. He could enjoy the innocent and tranquil pleasures of life, and had a human shrinking from suffering and death. In short, he had all the susceptibilities that are essential to humanity. To have these is no sin, but to yield to them when duty forbids is sin. To love pleasure rather than suffering is no sin, but to choose pleasure when duty calls us to suffer is sin.

Let us now examine the three temptations of Christ, with these evident truths in mind; bestowing our chief attention, however, on the last. It is easy to understand what were the first two, as recorded by Matthew. He was first assailed by the tempter through his hunger. The simple desire to satisfy his hunger, however strong that desire may have been, was not sinful. But he had an appointed time of fasting to fulfil. A desire to be freed from this duty would have been sin. But no such desire was awakened. Hungry and faint as he was, he yet could say with perfect promptness and cheerfulness, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."

The second temptation was, an appeal to his desire to be recognized as the Messiah. It would have been a joy to him to be thus recognized. It was a grief to him that he came to his own and his own received him not. It was a part of the burden which he bore that he was despised and rejected of men. But the Jews sought a sign from him. They asked him to work miracles which should accord with their ideas of what the Messiah ought to do. The tempter suggested that to cast himself from a pinnacle of the temple might induce them to receive him as the Messiah. The suggestion was a plausible one, looked at from a merely human stand-point. The performance of some such unmeaning, foolish freak would have gratified the love of the marvellous in the minds of the people far more than did his benign works of feeding the hungry, healing the sick, and raising the dead. But had he thereby secured their recognition of him, his triumph would not only have been a barren one, but would have been gained at the sacrifice of truth. It would have been by substituting a juggler's trick for the moral evi-

dence addressed to the faith of men, by a lowering of the claims of truth, and by pandering to a guilty, unbelieving state of mind. So he at once, and without any wavering or hesitation, put away the temptation to earn so barren a victory.

The third temptation, in which the adversary promised the Saviour "all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them," upon condition of his worshipping him, is more difficult to be understood. In what did the temptation here consist? It is usually said that the devil offered Christ the temporal rule of all the kingdoms of the world, or of some portion of them called the world, with all the riches and pomp and worldly power pertaining to such a position. But are there not serious objections to such a view? Is there the least evidence that such an offer would have been any temptation to Christ, that he had the least desire for such things as worldly riches, and power, and rank? The other things by which Satan tried to tempt him he did desire, if they could be had in the right way; but what reason is there to suppose that then, or at any other time, he wished upon any conditions to be a temporal ruler of all kingdoms, or of any one kingdom, on earth?

Or, again: If he had desired this, could the devil make a plausible pretence that he had it to give? If Christ did not desire worldly power, and the devil had none to confer, and it was palpably evident to any man that he had none, can he be supposed to have made so absurd an offer, or, if he did, would the offer have been any temptation to the Saviour?

We would propose another explanation of this point, not as one which we will as yet pledge ourselves to sustain, but as one which we are willing to leave to stand or fall as it shall approve itself, or fail to approve itself, to the judgment of the reader. It is this:

There is a sense in which this world is the devil's kingdom. He is called the prince of this world — the god of this world. It is to a great extent given over to his power. The exercise of this power is of course optional on his part. He can resign it if he chooses. Why not, then, suppose that this is just what he offered to do, to relinquish his sway over mankind, if Christ would worship him?

The termination of the rule of Satan in this world was a thing

which the Saviour desired. He came to destroy the works of the devil, and to deliver the world from his power. It was the object nearest his heart. It was the strongest possible temptation that could be presented to him. If Satan's influence over the hearts of men should cease, what an obstacle to the recovery of a ruined world to God would be removed! This is to be done sometime. Satan is to be bound, so that he can no more hurt the nations. Here he offers to retire from the struggle, and no more practise his hellish arts upon the souls of men. What a temptation to the loving, compassionate heart of the Redeemer, this picture of all the kingdoms of the world at once rescued from the grasp of the arch-enemy of man. But desirable as the thing in itself was, it was offered upon a condition that left no room for a moment's hesitation. The condition was in perfect keeping with the pride and ambition of him who could not, in heaven, brook the authority of his sovereign, and who would have doubtless been willing to give up all his power over man for one act of homage from the Son of God. There was but one being in the universe capable of such arrogance, and the moment that this Lucifer-like ambition discloses itself, the Saviour, as though for the first time clearly recognizing the tempter, exclaims, "Get thee hence, Satan."

It may be said that this proposition of Satan was an absurd one, as a compliance with its condition by the Saviour would defeat the end which he would have in view. But all sin involves absurdity; and the absurdity here is not as patent as it would be in the offer of temporal dominion, for here the Saviour desired the thing offered and Satan could give it. There was in it a kind of devilish plausibility that well becomes its author.

According to the view now presented, the temptations to which our Saviour was subjected were an appeal to his natural appetite, to his desire for recognition and honor, and to his benevolence. In this last, he was tempted to do evil that good might come. He was thus tempted in all essential points like as we are, with the important qualification — yet without sin. He was neither tempted by any sin in his own heart — the source of our strongest temptations; nor was he drawn into sin in the least degree. He thus in his experience comes near

us where we are weakest, and shows himself to be one with mankind in almost the only respect in which he could innocently stand upon common ground with all men, namely, in their exposure to temptation.

ARTICLE VII.

JOHN CALVIN.

THE two preachers, Farel and Calvin, felt that the field of labor in which they were so deeply interested must not be relinquished without an effort. After their so summary expulsion from Geneva, they proceeded to Berne and Zurich, hoping that their restoration might be accomplished through the intercession of these two reformed cities. At Zurich they found a synod assembled, before which they appeared and stated their case, while Bucer read in their behalf a paper drawn up in the handwriting of Calvin, in which were briefly declared the conditions on which they were willing to return. A part of these articles show their readiness to conform, in general, to the outward changes proposed by the Council of Berne, while in the remainder they by no means shift their ground as to the necessity of a firm internal discipline, in order to the safety of the church at Geneva. A letter was addressed from Zurich to the Genevese, exhorting them to patience with their ministers. It was also thought best that a deputation from Berne should accompany the banished ones to Geneva, and there act as mediators in the attempt to effect a reconciliation. This aid was granted, but all was in vain. The ministers were not even allowed to enter the city. Had they attempted to do so, their lives would have been the forfeit, for they afterwards learned that a regular ambush of banditti was lying in wait for them not far from the gates. Nor did the embassy from Berne succeed in its mission. The propositions they bore were rejected with new demonstrations of hatred and abhorrence, and the party of license signalized its triumph by acts of wild and in-

temperate disorder, only too prophetic of the period of riot and anarchy that was to follow.

Calvin and Farel now turned their steps towards Basle, which they at length reached, "well soaked with the rain, and completely spent and worn out," not without dangers encountered from the rapid mountain-torrents swollen by the rains. Even Farel seems to have been daunted by the experience he had just gone through, so that he would willingly have abandoned his post as preacher of the Gospel, in an age so unfavorable to Gospel order and peace. But he could not be false to what was so truly his mission, and the church at Neufchatel, which like that at Geneva owed its existence to him, obtained him, after much solicitation, to be their pastor. Calvin had found a home at Basle with the well known scholar and theologian Grynaeus, but he was soon very urgently called to Strasburg, that city so distinguished in the history of civil and religious liberty and of free education. Through the solicitations of Capito and Bucer, he was induced to accept the new charge offered to him, though Geneva still lay heavy on his heart. The persecutions in France had now driven many exiles into those cities and states which lay on its borders, where liberty could be found to worship God after the pure and simple rules of the Bible. Many such persons had collected in Strasburg, and it was proposed that Calvin should take them under his charge, and form them into the order and discipline of a church. This work was undertaken by him with great success, unhindered by any of those embarrassments which had assailed him at Geneva. He was even so happy as to convince some of those Anabaptists who had found their way thither, of the error of their opinions, and receive them to the communion. "That we may not boast, however," he says, in relating this circumstance to Farel, "and glorify ourselves in this service, the Lord humbles us in a thousand ways. Yet," he adds, "we have always this consolation — that we do not serve God in vain, even when, to all appearance, we seem to toil to no purpose."

The two years spent at Strasburg were among the most active and most fruitful in Calvin's life. Many of those labors were here commenced, and those relations entered into, which

form the thread and clue of its whole remaining history. Although the ordinary duties springing from his position must have occupied much of his time, for we find that he either lectured or preached daily, yet he found time for many other more strictly literary tasks. He here published a revised edition of the "Institutes," as well as a little work on "The Supper," remarkable as having received the approbation of Luther, always so excitable in regard to this subject. It was at this time, too, that there appeared at Geneva a translation of the Bible into French under Calvin's name. So far as Calvin was concerned, however, it was little more than a revision. But the most important work here produced was the Commentary on Romans, the first of that valuable series which occupied him till the end of his life. The claims of grammatical and exegetical criticism had doubtless not yet met with full recognition among biblical scholars, but great advances had necessarily been made in this direction. The qualities to be looked for in commentators were however quite different from those which are justly expected at the present day, as the wants of the age were also different. The sincere opinions of a great mind which has earnestly occupied itself in studying the text of Scripture will always be of value, especially when characterized by an energetic grasp of the subject, and presented with directness and in concise and forcible terms. When we consider that these qualities were united in the case of Calvin with high scholarship, a great degree of exegetical talent, together with a wonderfully clear insight into the doctrine of Scripture, considered as a whole, we cannot wonder at the great influence which these writings of his exerted upon his own times, and those which immediately succeeded. He avoided many faults which were fallen into by other expositors of that age, some of whom allowed themselves to be led quite away from the text by their earnestness in behalf of some particular dogma, or their zeal for the overthrow of some dangerous error, — more careful to obtain the support of Scripture for the truth they were desirous of defending, than to discover yet farther, from that sacred and inexhaustible source, what might still be wanting to the fulness or definiteness of their own conception. The aim of others was the instruction of a particular class, the

solution of difficult questions or of disputed readings. The labors of all were no doubt needed, but none were so well adapted to general usefulness, or so far attained that end, as those of Calvin. Most of his commentaries were soon translated into English, and probably had much influence in promoting and assisting the study of the Scriptures throughout England, at a time when they were beginning to be freely circulated. Though we must often go elsewhere for answers to some of the various questions that will arise in our minds as we carefully examine almost any passage of Holy Writ, yet we shall, on the other hand, often find it refreshing to turn from some vague and superficial annotator, to those living and forcible words of Calvin, ever going directly to the point, and often bringing out in vivid and concise expressions the most striking characteristics of the passage, turning up into the light at a single stroke some vein of pure gold that had lain before us quite undiscovered, while in a few brief and pregnant sentences he gathers up and comprehends the best results of all our investigation.

All this labor was accomplished in the midst of constant interruption, for Calvin was ever a man on whom others leaned, without leaning himself; and his advice and counsel were sought at all times and in relation to the most various subjects. His was one of those minds to which nothing ever seemed little or trifling, or beneath his attention. This is seen in various incidents of his life, and may be noticed particularly in his letters, from which one might suppose his mind to be quite taken up at one time in hiring a suitable house for Monsieur de Falais, or at another in saving him trouble from an unwelcome suitor for the hand of his ward. But at this very time he was perhaps spending his nights without sleep, owing to the overwhelming weight of his occupations. While at Strasburg, as well as afterwards, he admitted persons as members of his household, who were drawn by the hope of obtaining benefit from his daily conversation. Some of those who thus resided with him at Strasburg were French students, engaged in prosecuting their education at the university. A short extract from a letter to Farel will give some notion of the way in which his life was passed: "I do not remember throughout this whole year a single day which was more completely engaged with various

occupations; for when the present messenger wished to carry along with him the beginning of my book, there were about twenty leaves requiring revision. Add to this that I had to lecture, to preach, to write four letters, to settle some disputes, and to reply to more than ten interruptions in the meantime, you will therefore excuse if my letter should be both brief and inaccurate."

In the year 1539, Calvin was present at the colloquy of Frankfort, and in the two succeeding years, at those famous diets of the empire, held successively at Hagenau, at Worms, and at Ratisbon, where were made the final and most nearly successful efforts for an outward reunion of the Lutheran with the Catholic church. To the two last he was sent as a delegate from the city of Strasburg — a fact which shows the high confidence already reposed in him by the magistrates. His clear understanding, penetrating at once to the bottom of those difficulties and entanglements in which all affairs, both political and religious, were now involved, took away from the discussions and debates at which he was present impressions of the state of the empire and of the world very striking in their simplicity and wisdom, as we find them recorded in the long and confidential letters written at this period. It was under these circumstances that he was brought into relations of personal intercourse with many of the great German theologians; and that friendship with Melancthon, which outlasted all temporary causes of estrangement, and which was always clung to by Calvin as a thing too precious ever to be parted with, thus took its rise. It seems to have been founded on a remarkable similarity of views, especially in regard to certain points which were then exciting much discussion. The sterner texture of Calvin's mind led him afterwards to press the conclusions more or less common to them both with more urgency than to Melancthon appeared either wise or right, while a certain softness and timidity, on the part of the latter, sometimes induced him to adopt statements and lines of action which subjected him to Calvin's most earnest remonstrances. In consequence of an incident of this kind, the intercourse between them was at one time suspended for several years. Yet the sentiment of affectionate confidence seems never to have been lost. "I should

have written you frequently," says Melancthon, in a letter by which the long silence was at length broken, "had I been able to secure trustworthy letter-carriers. I should have preferred a conversation with you on many questions of very serious interest, inasmuch as I set a very high value on your judgment, and am conscious that the integrity and candor of your mind is unexceptionable. I am at present living as if in a wasp's nest. But perhaps I shall, ere long, put off this mortal life for a brighter companionship in heaven." "Would to God," says Calvin, in his reply, "we could speak together. I am not ignorant of your candor, of your transparent openness and moderation, and the angels and the whole world bear witness to your piety. Therefore this whole question would be easily, as I hope, arranged between us; wherefore, if an opportunity should present itself, I would desire nothing more than to pay you a visit. But if it shall indeed turn out as you apprehend, it will be no slight comfort to me, in circumstances sad and grievous, to see you and embrace you before I take my departure from this world." . . . "I know that I am far below you; but it is also true, that on whatever part of the stage God has placed me, our friendship cannot be destroyed without great injury to the church." . . . "Learn from your own heart," he adds, "how bitter it must be to find myself separated from a man whom I love and esteem above all others." And after Melancthon's death it is thus that Calvin apostrophizes him: "Oh, Philip Melancthon! to thee I address myself, to thee who art now living in the presence of God with Jesus Christ, and there awaitest us, till death shall unite us in the enjoyment of that divine peace. A hundred times hast thou said to me, when, weary with so much labor and oppressed with so many burdens, thou laidst thy head upon my breast, God grant — God grant that I may now die! But I, on my side, have also a thousand times wished that we had the happiness to live together. Our converse with each other would certainly have rendered thee bolder and more resolute in the struggle against wickedness and envy. Thou wouldst have resisted the machinations of falsehood with more strength and determination. Thus the malice of many would have been kept within narrower limits — the malice, that is, of those who, encouraged by your great

benevolence, which they called weakness, took occasion therefrom to triumph proudly in their guilt." *

It is well known that the immediate power of the great body of Protestantism was lessened at this time, as it has been ever since, by internal divisions. The followers of Zwingli and the followers of Luther would by no means agree in their opinions with regard to the sacrament of the Supper. The teachers of the church at Strasburg, together with Melancthon, held a mediatory position between these two parties, but went under the title of Lutherans; and it was as a Lutheran that Calvin was sent by the city of Strasburg to represent it at the diets of the empire, while yet his relations with the Swiss churches remained uninjured. It was always one of the chief objects of his life to restore to the church its broken-unity. Conscious that but one truth was really at the bottom in the expressions both of Luther and of the so-called Sacramentarians, he constantly endeavored to make this clear to both, and to bring them together on a higher ground than that of a mere outward formula or set of observances. And though during his lifetime he succeeded in little more than maintaining and establishing this unity within the bosom of the Reformed church itself, yet it is thought to be, in great measure, owing to his endeavors, that the barriers have been more and more broken down between the two great branches of the Protestant church on the continent of Europe, and that each is now freely acknowledged by the other.

* Dr. Henry well says, "This extraordinary man could not but be either loved or hated. It was impossible to look upon his course with indifference." What feelings of ardent enthusiasm he was capable of inspiring may be seen in the following extracts from a letter addressed to him by Johannes von Spina. After telling how long and how eagerly he had desired the opportunity of a personal acquaintance with Calvin, and how at length the coveted interview was obtained, he adds, "Mine eyes were fixed upon your countenance as long as my companions would allow. Their society was now become bitter and intolerable to me. I was still far from satisfied. In the interview which you granted me, short as it was, you had inspired me, by that mysterious power which seemed to breathe in your discourse and words, with a veneration which could not be surpassed. I am troubled from hour to hour with that desire to see you again which arose in my mind as you bade me farewell. And I hope my soul will not rest, till the Lord has united me to you in the bonds of eternal friendship. God grant that this may happen! In the mean time I pray you to write to me, and, as you can easily do, instruct me in all those things which relate to my salvation or my duty." . . . "May the Lord Jesus Christ preserve you in health, and free from harm — you, the most faithful of his servants, and of all the most necessary in these wicked times. Farewell in Christ."

It was the plan of the enemies of Protestantism to foment this dissension among its representatives, and so far as possible make use of it as an instrument for weakening the great party which was shaking, in its uprising, all the foundations and pillars upon which the ancient order of the world had so long rested in apparent security. In his account of the colloquy at Frankfort, where the princes of the league were convened for deliberation, and having already decided to declare war against the emperor, were only induced to change their determination by the strongest and most persuasive arguments of his ambassadors, who afterwards arrived, Calvin thus writes :

"The emperor's ambassador, notwithstanding all that has occurred, has ventured to propose such unjust terms of agreement, that the contest was very near being brought again to the decision of the sword. He required that our friends should have nothing to do with the Sacramentaries. Observe the artifice and wiles of Satan. He catches at this, forsooth, that not only the older and former hatred which he sowed might be kept up, but that new causes of offence may be applied like lighted torches, to set on fire and kindle greater dissensions. Indeed, our friends do not acknowledge that there are any Sacramentaries, and wish to unite with the Swiss churches, therefore the emperor has omitted that article."

Some of the difficulties on one side may be inferred from a portion of another letter, in which he gives an account of certain efforts made by the churches of Zurich and Strasburg to come to a mutual understanding :

"The good men flame up into a rage if any one dares to prefer Luther to Zwingli, just as if the gospel were to perish if anything is yielded by Zwingli. Nor, indeed, is there any injury thus done to Zwingli, for if the two men are compared together, you yourself know how much Luther has the preference. I do not at all approve, therefore, of those verses of Zebedeus, in which he supposed that he could not praise Zwingli according to his real worth, unless he said of him :

'Majorem sperare nefas.'

I am so far from assenting to him, that now, at this present, I can see many greater — I may hope for some more — I may lawfully desire that *all* were so." . . . "But these things are intended for your ear alone."

For a hint as to the temper of Luther in regard to these mat-

ters, and an illustration of the manner in which Calvin knew how to make allowance for the faults of this great man, we may take part of a letter addressed to Bullinger, a few years later. We might adopt some of these very words when called upon to pass judgment on the defects of Calvin's own character—defects which, proceeding from a temper quite different from that of Luther, yet have the same groundwork of zeal for what each considered as truth, and were sometimes exhibited in its too positive and intolerant assertion, but which were, nevertheless, hardly to be separated from the characters of men suited to stand in the forefront of the battle during that age of crisis and of conflict. The words are as follows :

“I hear that Luther assails not only you but all of us with horrible invective. Now I can scarcely ask you to be silent, since it is not right to allow ourselves to be so undeservedly abused, without attempting some defence. It is difficult, moreover, to believe that such forbearance could do any good. But of this I do earnestly desire to put you in mind, in the first place, how great a man Luther is ; by what extraordinary gifts he is distinguished ; with what strength of mind and resolute constancy, with how great skill, with what efficiency and power of doctrinal statement he hath hitherto devoted his whole energy to overthrow the reign of antichrist, and at the same time to diffuse far and near the doctrine of salvation. Often have I been wont to declare, that even although he were to call me a devil, I should not the less hold him in such honor that I must acknowledge him to be an illustrious servant of God. But while he is endued with rare and excellent virtues, he labors at the same time under serious faults. Would that he had rather striven to curb this restless, uneasy temperament, which is so apt to boil over in every direction. I wish, moreover, that he had always bestowed the fruits of that vehemence of natural temperament upon the enemies of the truth, and that he had not flashed his lightning sometimes also upon the servants of the Lord. Would that he had exercised more care to discover his own defects. Flatterers have done him much mischief, since he is naturally too prone to be over-indulgent to himself. It is our part, however, so to reprove whatsoever evil qualities may beset him, as that we may at the same time make some allowance for him on the score of those remarkable endowments with which he has been gifted. This, therefore, I would beseech you to consider first of all, along with your colleagues, that you have to do with a most distinguished servant of Christ, to whom we are all of us largely indebted.”

The marriage of Calvin took place in August, 1540. His wife was Idelette de Bures, the widow of one of those Anabaptists who, through his influence, had been drawn back into the bosom of the church. She seems to have been a woman of fine character, and to have had the full confidence and respect of her husband. Their union, though short, was a very happy one. She died when they had been married only nine years, and her loss left in his heart a lasting wound. Of their three children, the first of which was a son, and the second a daughter, all died in infancy. It is to the first of these that he so tenderly alludes in his reply to Baldwin: "God had given me a son. God hath taken my little boy. This he reckons up among my misdeeds, that I have no children. I have myriads of sons throughout the Christian world."

Just as Calvin was setting out for Worms, in the month of October, 1540, he received letters from Geneva, urgently inviting his return. Matters in that city had gone on from worse to worse ever since the departure of the two ministers. Their successors were weak men, themselves laboring under the imputation of some of the worst vices; and though they seem to have made some effort to stay the tide of corruption, yet the mighty torrent proved too strong for them. Calvin had not forgotten his beloved flock, but had already addressed to them letters of advice and consolation, and when some of them hesitated to receive the sacrament at the hands of unworthy men, had earnestly advised them to put aside their scruples, and to remember that the efficacy of that sacred rite depends, not on the character of him who administers it, but on its reception by a true church of God in the exercise of a living faith. When the cardinal Sadoletus, one of the purest-minded men in the Catholic party, had addressed them a letter, hoping that the evils under which they were now laboring would render them more willing to return to the bosom of the Romish church, and no one at Geneva was found able to answer it, Calvin willingly assumed the task, and by his eloquent reply called forth anew the gratitude of the church. He had heard with deep grief of their scattered and desolate state, but seems to have shrunk more and more from again entering upon a charge implying so much difficulty and danger, a life of storm and tempest little

suitied to that side of his nature of which he was as yet most thoroughly conscious, though no man was ever better adapted to take up the bitter task appointed to him, and carry it through with faith, with steadfast patience, with dignity and success.

The reception of this invitation seems to have taken him by surprise. He had already purchased the right of citizenship in Strasburg, and had enrolled himself in the guild of tailors. The struggle in his mind was very great. "You know," he says to Farel, referring to letters addressed to him by some of the brethren in Switzerland urging his acceptance, "that I have been so agitated this day by disquietude and anguish of soul, that I have not been half myself. . . . As often as I think how unhappy I was at Geneva, I tremble in my innermost being when mention is made of my return." He addressed a letter to the seigneurie of Geneva in which he gave expression to his sincere interest in that church, and desire to serve it, but explained to them at the same time how the nature of his engagements would not allow him to go immediately to their help, nor even to make any promises; "for so," he says, "I have always believed and taught, and to the present moment cannot persuade myself to the contrary, that when our Lord appoints a man as pastor in a church to teach in his word, . . . he may not lightly withdraw from it, without the settled assurance in his own heart, and the testimony of the faithful, that the Lord has discharged him." Meantime he advises them to obtain for the present the assistance of Viret, hoping that the Lord would open up a way in the meantime on the one hand or the other.

This advice was followed, and with excellent results; but the people were now sighing for their own pastor, feeling that no one else was equal to the great work of establishing them in order and in peace. Nor did Viret and Farel cease to urge him with their entreaties. To Viret he writes: "I could not read one part of your letter without laughing. It is that in which you exhibit so much care for my prosperity. Shall I then go to Geneva to secure my peace? Why not rather submit to be crucified? It would be better to perish at once than to be tormented to death in that chamber of torture. If you indeed wish my welfare, dear Viret, pray cease from such advice as this."

The Genevese messengers pursued him to Worms, and he sent thence a kind reply, which did not deprive them of hope. When the six months for which Viret had been lent them was nearly expired, a circular letter was addressed by the Genevese magistrates to the governments of Berne, Basle, and Zurich, entreating their intercession with the magistrates of Strasburg in this matter. Expressing their penitence for the expulsion of their pastors, they say: "From the hour that they were banished we have had nothing but troubles, enmities, strifes, contention, disorders, seditions, factions, and homicides, so that by this time we should have been completely overwhelmed, unless God in his mercy, compassionately beholding us, had sent our brother Viret, who was formerly a pastor here, to gather this miserable flock, which was so dispersed as scarcely to have any longer the appearance of a church. We acknowledge, therefore, that this great anger of God hath fallen upon us, because our Lord Jesus Christ hath been thus rejected and despised in his servants and ministers, and that we are unworthy ever to be esteemed his faithful disciples, or ever to find quiet in our State, unless we endeavor to repair these offences, so that the honor of the most holy evangelical ministry be restored; and by common consent we desire nothing more ardently than that our brethren and ministers be reinstated in their former place in this church, to which they were called by God."

At length Calvin yielded to the many and urgent entreaties which came upon him from all sides, and the city of Strasburg gave a reluctant consent to his departure. From this time he hastened forward to the work. "When I remember that I am not my own," he writes, "I offer up my heart, presented as a sacrifice to the Lord." He returned to Geneva, Sept. 13, 1541.

ARTICLE VIII.

SINNERS' RIGHTS.

THE popular doctrine of the Rights of Man is derived from the consideration of man as man, and not of man as a sinner. The premises, therefore, are incomplete, and the reasoning more or less false. Even when the conclusions are correct, they are held on wrong grounds, and in a wrong spirit, and may lead to wrong inferences and applications. These errors, working diversely in divers minds, north and south, have contributed largely to produce the sins and sufferings which we now witness and endure. The truth on this subject, clearly seen and heartily embraced throughout the land, would restore all the blessings of peace and good government, sooner and more effectually than it can be done by military power or diplomacy. All this, though the subject is far too vast for a full discussion here, we hope to put such of our readers as will think on the subject and follow it out for themselves, in a way to see and know.

The prevalent doctrine is well stated by the Rev. Dr. Sears, in the "*Bibliotheca Sacra*" for January, 1863, page 130. He says:

"The doctrine of modern philosophy, now generally received by political writers, is, that every human being is equally a human being, and that all are equally entitled to what belongs to man as man. The essential principle involved in this statement is that of personality. Every human being is a *person*, and not a *thing*; and ought, consequently, to be treated as a person — never as a thing. To a given extent, he has within himself an end for which he exists, and ought never to sink to the rank of a mere means to ends to be realized in others. A brute may be (humanely) used exclusively for the benefit of man. A human being cannot properly be so used by his fellow-man.

"The right to exist as a person implies the right to develop, in a legitimate way, one's individuality. A man's own nature, powers, tastes, and facilities are to dictate the kind and manner of his activity. No other being has a right to interfere with his individuality, which,

for wise and good purposes, was given him by his Creator, so long as the action growing out of it is conformed to the law both of his individual and social being. It is by means of such individual freedom, properly limited and guarded by society, that men most properly fulfil the end of their being, both with reference to themselves and to others."

Substantially the same is the statement of Dr. Wayland, in his "Elements of Moral Science." Of the "Nature of Personal Liberty," he says :

"Every human being is, by his constitution, a separate and distinct and complete system, adapted for all the purposes of self-government, and responsible, separately, to God, for the manner in which his powers are employed. Thus, every individual possesses a body, by which he is connected with the physical universe, and by which that universe is modified for the supply of his wants ; an understanding, by which truth is discovered, and by which means are adapted to their appropriate ends ; passions and desires, by which he is excited to action, and in the gratification of which his happiness consists ; conscience, to point out the limits within which these desires may be rightly gratified ; and a will which determines him to action. The possession of these is necessary to a human nature, and it also renders every being, so constituted, a distinct and independent individual. He may need society, but every *one* needs it equally with *every other one* ; and hence, all enter into it upon terms of strict and evident reciprocity. If the individual uses these powers according to the laws imposed by his Creator, his Creator holds him guiltless. If he use them in such a manner as not to interfere with the use of the same powers which God has bestowed upon his neighbor, he is, as respects his neighbor, whether that neighbor be one individual or the community, independent. So long as he uses them within this limit, he has a right, so far as his fellow-men are concerned, to use them, in the most unlimited sense, *suo arbitrio*, at his own discretion. His will is a sufficient and ultimate reason. He need assign no other reason for his conduct than his own free choice. Within this limit, he is still responsible to God, but within this limit, he is not responsible to *man*, nor is *man* responsible for him."

We will quote here but one more authority ; "The Rights of Man," by Thomas Paine :

"Every history of the creation, and every traditionary account, whether from the lettered or unlettered world, however they may

vary in their opinion or belief of certain particulars, all agree in establishing one point — *the unity of man* — by which I mean, that man, considered as man, is all of *one degree*, and consequently that all men are born equal, and with equal natural rights." — *Chapter I.*

"Natural rights are those which appertain to man in right of his *existence*. Of this kind are all the *intellectual* rights, or rights of the *mind*; and also, all those rights of acting, as an individual, for his own comfort and happiness, which are not injurious to the natural rights of others.

"Civil rights are those which appertain to man, in right of his being a member of society. Every civil right has, for its foundation, some natural right preëxisting in the individual, but to which his individual power is not, in all cases, sufficiently competent. Of this kind are those which relate to *security* and protection." — *Chapter II.*

His "principles as universal as truth and the existence of man, and combining moral with political happiness and national prosperity," are,

"1st. These are born and always continue to be free, and equal in respect to their rights. Civil distinctions, therefore, can be founded only on public utility.

"2d. The end of all political associations is, the preservation of the natural and imprescriptible rights of man; and these rights are — liberty, property, security, and resistance of oppression.

"3. The nation is, essentially, the source of all sovereignty; nor can any individual, or any body of men, be entitled to any authority which is not expressly derived from it." — *Chapter IV.*

These quotations are amply sufficient to show what is the prevalent doctrine. They are all essentially the same; though the application of the fundamental idea to the formation and authority of government is most fully and clearly drawn out by the last.

It is noticeable, that all these writers shrink back from carrying their argument as far as it would naturally go. They all, after stating it, perceive the necessity of subjoining a limitation, to hold it back from doing mischief. Paine limits the rights of man, considered as man, to those "which are not injurious to the natural rights of others." Wayland's limitation is, that man must use his powers "in such a manner as not to interfere with the use of the same powers which God has bestowed

upon his neighbor." "Modern philosophy," as set forth by Dr. Sears, limits the right of developing one's individuality to development "in a legitimate way," "conformed to the law both of his individual and social being," and requires the freedom of the individual to be "properly limited and guarded by society."

This idea of limitation is certainly correct, and of indispensable importance. But whence does it come? Not from the premises already laid down. The fact that man was created with certain powers does not prove that he must not use those powers to their full extent. If his ability to see an oak considered by itself, without reference to other considerations, proves his right to see an oak, his ability to see a pine equally proves his right to see a pine; and his ability to do anything else, proves his right to do it. Reasoning straightforward on such principles, the idea of limitation is not only not reached, but utterly excluded.

This idea of limitation, then, must come from some other source than the consideration of the powers which belong to man as man. And if so, that other source must always be consulted, if we would know whether any particular act is within or beyond the limits of right. That is to say, we can never learn, by considering merely the powers which belong to man as man, what he has, and what he has not, a right to do. All these writers, by admitting this idea of limitation, condemn their own premises as incomplete.

Paine's language shows that he saw one weak point in his system, which needed guarding. He takes care to say, not only that "men are born," but that they "*always continue* to be free and equal in respect to their rights." He saw that being born with certain rights does not necessarily prove that men have those rights some years afterwards. The French Jacobin constitutions, under their first republic, carefully guard the same point.

And that point evidently needs attention. That men may "continue" to possess all the rights with which they are "born" or "created," they must "continue in that estate wherein they were created." If they "fall from that estate," they forfeit all that belonged to them on the ground of their being in

it. Paine and the French Jacobins deny any such forfeiture, and of course any such fall.

And here, writing for persons of all creeds and of no creed, we shall not appeal to the third chapter of Genesis. Whether that chapter be history, allegory, or myth; whether Adam's moral character was changed, or only exhibited, in eating the forbidden fruit; whether his sin was imputed to his posterity, or inherited by them, or both; whether there was only one Adam, the parent of all men, or half a dozen, or half a thousand Adams, all so much alike that the history of any one of them is substantially the history of all the others;—these are important questions on which we have very decided opinions; but we need not urge them here. Everybody knows that the conduct of Adam in respect to the forbidden fruit, as there described, is a fair sample of human conduct through the whole history of the race. Men have, all of them, eaten forbidden fruit themselves; or done some other forbidden thing equivalent thereto. Everybody knows that they all will do it, and must be dealt with accordingly. This is so certain, that society does not permit them to go at large, but keeps them “under tutors and governors” for the first quarter of their lives or more, in the hope that they may be taught so much necessary restraint as will render them endurable. In this hope, society is disappointed by many of them, and is obliged to shut them up for a term of years, or for life, at hard labor under strict discipline, and even to remove many of them from the world, as unfit to live in it. Are such creatures entitled to claim the rights which belong to “man considered as man,” in “the estate wherein he was created?”

It seems as if this defect in their premises might have been suggested to “modern philosophy,” and even to French Jacobinism, by the necessity under which they found themselves of introducing limitations to the rights of man. What suggested the necessity of limiting the rights of man, to such use of his faculties as would not interfere with the rights of his neighbor? What but the consciousness that the character of man is such that he needs restraint? Would the thought have occurred to Gabriel, if employed to state the rights of angels considered as angels?

Man, considered as man, in the estate in which he was created, must be considered as personally innocent, even if not innocuous in his nature. He is a being who has not yet committed any sin, either against God or his neighbor. We need not inquire here, how long that state of innocence continues; whether it continues at all, or whether it is confined to that indivisible point of time in which he is created, and from which he immediately starts off into sinning. The fact is palpable, unquestionable, unquestioned, that when he is so far grown up that he can claim rights, or be dealt with as a member of society, he has, by his own action, already passed out of that state into a state of personal guiltiness; "a state of sin and misery," and has thereby forfeited whatever rights would have belonged to him, had he continued in a state of innocence.

For consider, that "the wages of sin is death." He has, therefore, forfeited his right to "life," and with it go his right to "liberty, property, security, and resistance of oppression." "The soul that sinneth, it shall die," is a righteous law. He deserves to die, even if he breaks but a single commandment, and that only in a single instance. How, then, can he come forward and claim the rights which belong to him "considered simply as man;" the rights which would belong to him if he were as he was created?

No. "God made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions," which are in contrast with that uprightness, and they must be dealt with accordingly. On the ground of rights, he can award them nothing but the "wages" which they have earned, which is "death." If he awards them, or allows them to receive and enjoy, anything better, it must be on the ground, not of their rights, but of his mercy. If they had continued righteous, they would have been justified and have lived by works of righteousness which they had done; and their reward would have been of debt, and not of grace. Then they could have claimed, as their rights, all things that belong to man considered as man, and not as sinner. But as all have sinned and become guilty, they can claim no good thing as their right, nor be allowed to have any good thing, except of God's mercy. "Where is boasting, then? It is excluded;" and when any of them come to feel and submit to this truth, that

boasting, grasping spirit which claims and fights for, as a right, what they can receive only as an undeserved favor, dies away, and the spirit of humility, which is the spirit of peace, takes the place of pride, by which cometh contention. Truth and error on this subject, therefore, differ widely in their practical results.

Will it be said that though man, by sinning against God, has so forfeited his rights that God may justly exact the forfeiture, yet he has not so offended against man as to forfeit them, and therefore, as against man, his claim still remains good?

"Has not offended against man!" Is it no offence against man, to set an example of insubordination to God? Does not man's best interest require that God should reign, and that all his creatures should obey him, heartily, perfectly, and always? And does not every sin of every sinner interfere with and oppose the highest good, the most valuable interests, of the whole human race? Does he do no injury to his neighbor, who encourages him, by example, to earn the wages of sin, which is death? If Adam injured mankind when he, by disobedience, "brought death into the world, and all our woe," do not modern sinners inflict injury, when, by behaving like him, they do their part to keep the world full of death and woe? Certainly, beyond all doubt, every man, by what he has done to bring death on other men through sin, deserves to suffer death himself. His injured neighbor may not be able, consistently, to throw the first stone at him; but he deserves that it should be thrown, with accurate aim and complete effect.

We are aware that Jefferson says, in his "Notes on Virginia," and Paine quotes approvingly in his "Rights of Man," that "It does me no injury for my neighbor to say that there are twenty gods, or no god; it neither picks my pocket nor breaks my leg." Most men are conscious of having other and higher interests than legs and pockets, in which they may be injured. But even in respect to these, the reasoning will not hold. He who encourages my neighbor to believe that my pocket may be picked, or my leg or head be broken, and no God will ever notice the matter, does me a positive injury. He is an accomplice before the fact, and a partaker of the guilt, and deserves to share in the punishment. Everything that encourages insubordination to God, is a sin against man; and therefore, in

its relation to men, is a loss of innocence and a forfeiture of the rights which belong to the innocent.

It is impossible, therefore, to arrange a system for the government of men in this life, on the basis of their rights considered as *men*. Such a system could only doom the whole race to instant extermination. Under it, there could be nobody left to govern, and nobody to be governed. The short logic and the short process would be, that all have sinned, and therefore all must die, and that immediately. Anything less severe than this must be on the basis, not of man's rights, but of God's mercy. The continuance of the human race on earth is proof that, in dealing with man, God has set aside the basis of his rights as man, and adopted that of mercy to man as a sinner. And if our thoughts are to be in harmony with those of God, we must do the same.

And should we not bring our thoughts into harmony with those of God? Certainly we must, unless we are willing to repudiate the idea of God's mercy and take the consequences. He requires it of us. He allows us to pray for the forgiveness of our own trespasses, only "as we forgive those who trespass against us." And if the human race is to continue on earth, we must, to a greater or less extent, deal with each other on the basis of mercy; for if we should deal with each other on the basis of unmitigated rights, we should exterminate each other at once. The laws of Draco, punishing every offence with death, were not unjust, for every offence deserves death; but they were unmerciful, and therefore unfit to be administered by men, in a world like this.

Indeed, modern philosophers themselves, if we hold them strictly to the limitations which they find themselves obliged to fix and appear immediately to forget, very nearly concede all this. According to Dr. Sears, the rights which pertain to man as man continue only "*so long as* the action growing out of one's individuality is conformed to the law both of his individual and social being." According to Dr. Wayland, man's right to the free use of his powers continues only "*so long as* " he uses them in such a manner as not to interfere with the free use of the same powers by his neighbor. And how long is that, in the case of those who "go astray as soon as they be

born, speak in lies?" Do they not all come under the need of mercy "as soon as they be born?"

Will these philosophers tell us, where are the men on earth, living and acting within the limits which they have prescribed for the application of their doctrine? Such men do not exist. Their system is applicable, according to their own showing, only to a world into which sin has not entered. A world like this must be destroyed at once, or placed under some other system than theirs.

For this system of rights belonging to man as man, is not a system that can be modified, and adapted to the weakness of human nature, and still retain its identity. It is, in its essential nature, a system of strict right. It is a law of works. Its language is, "He that doeth these things, shall live by them;" and "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the book of this law, to do them." By accepting anything else instead of constant and perfect obedience, its very nature is changed, and it becomes a system of mercy. Even if the same privileges are granted to men who have sinned, as would have been theirs if innocent, they are granted as of mercy, and not as of right; and if men need such privileges, they are to be requested with humility and received with gratitude, as favors to the unworthy, and not to be claimed as rights.

Nor may we argue, that as all men are equally sinners, therefore their equality remains, and their rights remain, as towards each other, unforfeited. Their equality may remain, but it is an equality of forfeiture. The system of rights admits of no offsets of sin against sin. That the human judge is as deep in guilt and forfeiture as the culprit before him, does not in the least alter the fact of the culprit's guilt and forfeiture. It can only be a reason why the guilty judge should show that mercy which he equally needs himself.

We live, then, under a system of mercy; a system under which God deals with men more favorably than they deserve. He rejects the system of rights, growing out of the nature of man as man, as a law which could not give life to us; and we must reject it, as the basis of our relations to him, or die. And he requires us to harmonize and coöperate with him, in carrying

out his system of mercy to men. If, when we owe ten thousand talents which we cannot pay, our Lord freely forgives us the debt, we must not seize our fellow-servant, who owes us an hundred pence, by the throat, demanding that which belongs to us on the basis of rights, lest our Lord be wroth and deliver us to the tormentors, to be dealt with according to our own doctrine. The law of mercy is God's law for the world, on which he not only acts himself, but requires us to act. Our rights now, if we may be said to have any, are not such as pertain to man as man, but such as pertain to man as a sinner, under a dispensation of mercy.

This change in the basis of what we call our rights, requires a change in the whole spirit and style of their administration. "The quality," the very nature "of mercy is," that it is unconstrained, and "falleth like the gentle dew from heaven." It voluntarily goes beyond any definite obligation, that could be put into Shylock's bond and enforced by the courts. It seeks to do good unto all men, as it has opportunity, whether they deserve it or not. It is bestowed, by men, "in a spirit of meekness," considering that they themselves have often been tempted, and need more of it than they bestow. It is received, when men receive it in a proper spirit, not as the satisfaction of a claim by the payment of a debt, which makes the parties even, but as an undeserved favor, for which gratitude is a proper return. He who feels his need of it does not seize his fellow-servant by the throat, saying, "Pay me that money which thou owest;" but appeals to his own need of mercy, and to their common need of mercy, both from God and from man. True, this is not always expressed; but among right-minded men who understand each other, it is always taken for granted.

And here comes in the true application of the doctrine of expediency to the administration of human affairs. On the basis of the rights of man as man, expediency can have no place. The motto of that system is, "*Fiat justitia, ruat cælum*;" that is, "Let strict justice be done, though the whole human race go to perdition," as it inevitably would. But on the basis of mercy, of doing to the unworthy all the good we can, considerations of expediency must have their place. We must consider how we may do the most good. We must ask,

by the bestowment of what undeserved favor we can most promote the well-being of those who deserve only punishment ; by what governmental arrangements, and what administration of them, we can best coöperate with God, in his merciful designs to a guilty world.

And in coöperating with God, we should, of course, be instructed by his example. He does not immediately exact from the sinner the full forfeiture of the rights which pertain to him as man. He does not at once, in all cases, take away the sinner's forfeited life, but allows most of them a space for repentance. So we should let them live till their own conduct makes it necessary to hang them. So, too, we should not, at once, exact the whole forfeiture of their right to liberty, but should let them enjoy as much of it as we can, with advantage to themselves and safety to their neighbors. This is a clear duty, under a dispensation of mercy.

On the basis of the rights of man as man, government can be nothing but the result of a "social compact," in the fullest and most literal sense of the words. Man has certain natural rights which belong to him as man. Some of these he is unable to protect and enforce without the aid of other men. Several who find themselves thus situated enter into a compact, by which they agree to defend each other in the enjoyment of those rights. In the words of Paine :

"The fact, therefore, must be, that the individuals themselves, each in their own personal and sovereign right, *entered into a compact with each other*, to produce a government : and this is the only mode in which governments have a right to arise, and the only principle on which they have a right to exist." — *Rights of Man, Chapter II.*

On this principle, if a man has never consented to be under any government, no government has, or can acquire, any rightful authority over him. If he has consented, he is bound only so far as he has, understandingly, consented to be bound. If his consent is only constructive, only an inference from the fact that he has been under government and submitted to it when he could not help himself, he cannot feel bound by that consent, as if it had been given deliberately, when he was in a condition to consent or refuse. And if he afterwards finds, or thinks he

finds, that he made a mistake in giving that assent, or allowing it to be inferred, it will be hard to convince him that he has not a right to rectify that mistake, either by nullifying that act of government to which he ought not to have consented, or by seceding from government altogether. His right to resist, on his own authority, any act of government to which he has not given his consent, is perfect and unquestionable.

All advocates of this system agree, that a man's natural rights extend only to such things as do not conflict with the natural rights of others. This limitation shows a consciousness in their own minds, that their system tends to conflicts of rights. Of course, it tends to controversies about rights, and to decisions of those controversies, unpleasant to one party, or to both. But the parties are not bound to submit these controversies to the decision of government, or to respect its decisions when given, or to permit their execution by force, any farther than they have previously consented to be so bound. And if either party finds the decision so unreasonable that he ought not to have foreseen it as possible when he gave his consent, he cannot feel that he ever consented to be bound by such a decision. Evidently, this doctrine, applied to a world like this, is a prolific breeder of quarrels. "Only by pride cometh contention;" and none but proud men can forget that they are sinners, and have forfeited the rights which belong to man as man.

Very different is the tendency of the true doctrine, that men have forfeited their natural rights; that God has placed them under a dispensation of mercy; that, for the execution of his purposes of mercy, he requires them to maintain and administer government, and be in subjection to it; that government should leave men in the enjoyment of such portions and fragments of their natural rights as public safety permits, and that they must submit to such limitation as government, administered in mercy, finds it necessary to impose. Under this system, no man can demand, for himself or for his neighbor, all the rights that pertain to man considered simply as man, and not as a sinner; and every man is bound, whether he consents or not, to coöperate with God, and with government, which is one of his agents, in his merciful work of restraining evil and doing good. If God has given him wisdom, he may use that

wisdom in modifying the form and action of government, so that it shall better accomplish its objects ; but he must use it in a lawful way.

These principles make short and effectual work with "the divine right of kings" and of dynasties, to dominion over the inhabitants of certain territories, and to all other claims of sinners, to the right of exercising, for their own benefit, dominion over other sinners. He who has forfeited his own right to life and liberty, would not retain, unforfeited, his right to dominion over others, even if he had ever possessed it. Under a dispensation of mercy, where all rights have been forfeited, men may sustain only such relations to each other as may be administered for the ends and in the spirit of mercy.

But the claims of tyrants, public or domestic, are to be resisted only on such principles, in such a spirit, and by such means, as are consistent with truth and with the actual facts of the case. They cannot be rightfully, or safely, resisted by assuming, as the logical basis of resistance, that men have not fallen by sin and forfeited their rights. The horrors of the first French revolution were the inevitable product of that logic, pervading, as it did, the mass of French mind, and of the passions which that logic, dominant in the minds of such a population, inevitably excited. That error, whenever it has hold enough on any people to produce any practical effect, must, from its nature, produce effects of the same kind.

On the contrary, the claims of tyrants, (we use the word in its old Greek meaning, to designate one who seizes authority to which he has no right, however he may use that authority,) the claims of tyrants are to be resisted as inconsistent with the dispensation of mercy under which we are placed ; a dispensation which forbids men to sustain any relations to each other, except such as are required by the ends and administered in the spirit of mercy. On this basis, all tyranny is effectually excluded, and excluded by such arguments as appeal unanswerably to every man's conscience, and to such feelings only as God and conscience approve.

How far the error here pointed out has pervaded the American mind, and how far it has misled the reasonings and injured the spirit of the pulpit, the political assemblage, and the

press, we will not attempt to decide. We only suggest, that each one should consider, candidly, seriously, patiently, how far it may have affected himself and his influence. We say, *patiently*; for the full discovery, if any needs to be made, will not be made at once. By those who have always held the common doctrine of "modern philosophy," this article will be understood but very imperfectly, if it be not wholly misunderstood, on the first perusal. A change of system, so fundamental and far-reaching as we have endeavored to indicate, cannot be completed in a day. There must be time to become familiar with it, and with its numerous inferences, applications, and relations to other subjects, before the merits of the system, if true, can be fully appreciated, and sometimes before even its leading propositions can be fully and correctly understood. But to extricate ourselves from the misguidance of a false theory, and to place our doctrine of social and political life on a true and safe basis, and to bring our habits of thought and feeling and expression into conformity with it, must be worth all of time and patient labor that it can possibly cost.

ARTICLE IX.

SHORT SERMONS.

"Unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required." — *Luke*
xii. 48.

CHRIST takes a common principle of equity among men, and applies it to the conduct of the divine government over us. The general idea is, that opportunities measure responsibilities. Several points present themselves as involved in the subject :

1. Spiritual knowledge has been developed gradually to mankind. A law of progressiveness obtains in the moral as well as the material world. Light has advanced from morn to meridian in revelation as in nature. But,

2. Through all the stages of the growing illumination, God has condemned and punished sinners. Because, he has an original and inde-

structible claim on their love, and in the worst conditions of moral ignorance, man has light enough to show him the equity of that claim.

3. Increase of knowledge brings increased obligation, and adds to the guilt of disobedience. If an antediluvian Enoch could walk with God, much more should the contemporaries of Abraham, and Moses, and David, and Isaiah have kept his testimonies. If Sodom, and Nineveh, and Tyre were guilty, much more were Capernaum, and Bethsaida, and Jerusalem.

4. Rebellion against God assumes no form more culpable and fatal than under the Gospel's offered grace. The apostle specifies the reason. It treads under foot the Son of God, in the temper of an indifference to his person, or of hardened hostility against his redemption. It counts the blood of the covenant wherewith he (Jesus) was sanctified (set apart as a victim) an unholy (a common) thing; undervaluing his atonement, and rejecting its proposals of reconciliation. It does despite to the Spirit of grace; grieves and resists him, until this sin becomes the sin unto death, which hath no forgiveness.

Three observations are suggested by this train of thought :

(a) It is proper to show impenitent persons the alarming aspects of their case with utmost faithfulness.

(b) It is safe to make our appeal to the sinner's own conscience, to attest the righteousness of his condemnation.

(c) A most undesirable but unavoidable interview and settlement is hastening between the incorrigibly disobedient and the Lord Jesus Christ. If much requires more, what must be the doom of him who renders no return for richest gifts from God?

"What! could ye not watch with me one hour?" — *Matt.* xxvi. 40. *

OBSERVE what are emphatically the watching hours of the soul. These may be prominently noted :

1. The hour of personal trials ; — that, while the waves of trouble roll over it, however terribly, it lose not, like Job, its confidence in God ; but still shall sing the psalm of Habakkuk — "Although the fig-tree do not blossom . . . yet will I rejoice in the Lord."

2. The hour of personal temptations ; — that, though Satan and the flesh renew the scenes of the desert and the mountain, to the Christian, he shall, through Christ's aid, repeat the victory of his Great Exemplar over the subtlety of the Adversary.

3. The hour of general religious declension ; — that, though all others should deny and desert his Lord, he shall not only say, "Yet will not I be offended" ; but shall be found faithful among the faithless.

4. The hour of excessive worldly excitements ; — that, if the passions of the multitude be aroused to feverish heat, in the pursuit of business, or speculations, or political partisanships, or fashionable follies, or irreligious hatreds, he shall not be floated or forced away from his Christian consistency and steadfastness ; shall not be separated from his Master's side.

That Master's pathetic appeal to his unwatchful disciples, furnishes two inducements to us thus to keep alive our vigilance :

(a) "With me." It is still a claim on his disciples' sympathy and sense of honor to sentinel his person and his kingdom amid ever-clustering dangers. At the same time, Christ watches with his friends. It is never a solitary vigil, whether in the wilderness, or on the ocean, in the city, or midst the anguish and faintness of the chamber of disease and death.

(b) "One hour." Only this — a little hour of Gethsemane wakefulness and fidelity, for the Christian, and then no more need forever of holy care and guarded defence.

"Because the way is *short*, I thank thee, God !"

ARTICLE X.

LITERARY NOTICES.

The New American Cyclopædia : a popular Dictionary of General Knowledge. Edited by GEORGE RIPLEY and CHARLES A. DANA. Royal 8vo. Volumes I. — XVI., with a Supplement. New York : D. Appleton & Co. London : 16 Little Britain. 1863.

THE gentlemen engaged in bringing out this work have shown great enterprise in completing so promptly their undertaking amid the embarrassments of the past two years. It was begun less than six years ago, and has been issued at the rate of about two and a half volumes a year. We learn from authentic sources that the capital invested in this literary venture amounts to the formidable sum of \$415,000. A

house must have princely resources at its command to embark in such a project. Some twenty-five able writers, and a large retinue of inferior pens, have supplied the material of these pages. It is announced as the first original general Cyclopædia completed in this country; 'original' (we suppose) as not being a translation from abroad; for a large part of its contents can, of course, lay claim to no originality other than in the form of its compilation. This does not lessen its value, which we have found to be great, as, from its first appearance, we have had it under constant consultation.

We appreciate the difficulties of editing a thesaurus of knowledge like this; and consequently think that, intended as they are for universal and permanent reference, a larger care should be exercised in selecting the responsible management of these works than always is apparent. A partisan bias, distinct or covert, in any direction, secular or religious, in this sphere of literature, is a public wrong. It is like poisoning the wells of a country to write, for example, such a work as "Bayle's *Dictionnaire historique et critique*," or the "*Encyclopédie raisonnée*" of the French infidels, and send it abroad as a trusty textbook of philosophy, science, and morals. The more learned and able it may be, the worse for the world, if its ethics and theism be unsound. We have certainly felt a deep interest in the quality of the information to be stereotyped, for generations to come, upon these topics, in this publication. It is known to our readers that its editors, scholarly, and variously accomplished, as they are, are not in sympathy with the religious and social views which we represent. We fully believe that they have made it a point to hold the balances as evenly as could be expected between opposite schools as found among their patrons. Still, it would not be safe to take these dissertations in theology, for instance, as a decisive authority. The treatment of points lying between the Romanists and ourselves presents many objectionable features. In the very delicate department of biography they have shown much discrimination and impartiality. We do not remember any very marked exception to this statement, save one which drew out a general condemnation from the religious press, at the time of its issue — the account of Thomas Paine. The '*Nil mortuis*' has seldom been stretched so freely as by the writer of that paper. In dealing with living persons, the editors have displayed much expert pilotage along not a few intricate channels. This is an original feature of their volumes, and one which, though regarded a little questionable at the start, may be pronounced a fair success. Of course, all the *distingués*, who here see "their natural face in a glass," and their friends as well, are sure for a copy of the immortalizing record. They, whom Jupiter has not

lifted into that 'milky way,' behold their light from afar with appropriate admiration.

This work reflects the strong tendencies of the age in the way of a material development, by its elaborate and critical treatises in the departments of general physics and economics. It condenses the results of investigation in the various sections of experimental philosophy and social science, and furnishes a vast amount of useful statistics gathered from every corner of the natural world. The most eminent contemporary ability has been subsidized to give authority to these *résumés*.

Cyclopædias, however, are only approximations to the true knowledge of subjects, not more on account of their necessary conciseness than of the transition-state in which most things are. Already, this progress of change has demanded a half volume of "Supplement" to this series, running down the whole alphabet, and an additional entire volume besides is in preparation to overtake the march of discovery, invention, and speculation. This present Supplement seems largely occupied with matters which have come to the surface during our present war. Glancing along its titles, many of which only just now are sporting a fresh newspaper notoriety, we would suggest that possibly the editors are making rather more of some men and things, in these addenda, than a few years hence may justify; as, *e. g.*, Fitz John Porter — whose record here lacks its important sequel; John Pope, Justus McKinstry, Daniel E. Sickles, and other names which illustrate the difficulty of stopping at the right place in these elections of candidates for literary degrees. We honestly hope that the forthcoming volume will not undertake to continue all these living biographies, *pari passu*. We beg to be spared the intrusion of our war-heroisms and disgraces into every branch of letters. A cyclopædia is a *circle* of knowledge, and it must keep up its universality, or lose its value. We close this notice with expressing much satisfaction that the *Encyclopædia Americana* has given place to this, in most respects, greatly superior successor.

Men and Times of the Revolution; or, Memoirs of Elkanah Watson, including his Journal of Travel in Europe and America, from the year 1777 to 1842, and his Correspondence with Public Men, and Reminiscences and Incidents of the American Revolution. Edited by his Son, WINSLOW C. WATSON. Second edition; with a Portrait of the Author, engraved on Steel, after the famous Portrait by Copley, and twenty Wood Engravings. 12mo. pp. 557. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1861.

ONE of the intelligent, sagacious, indomitable men, without a multitude of whom the achievement of our national independence would have been impossible, left behind him copious journals, correspondence, and auto-biographical collections, out of which this thoroughly readable book has been constructed. It is a fresh, life-like photograph of the country when Boston was half a mile wide and two miles long; when the spot where Washington now is was an open champaign in which the author got lost returning from a horseback tour from New England to Georgia (1778); and when at Saratoga, "I met with about a dozen respectable people, sojourning at a wretched tavern. . . . There is no convenience for bathing, except an open log-hut, with a large trough, similar to those in use for feeding swine, which receives water from a spring. Into this you roll from a bench." It was no better at Ballston: "At the foot of this hill I found an old barrel with the staves open, stuck into the mud in the midst of a quagmire, surrounded with trees, stumps, and logs. This was the Ballston Spring. I observed two or three ladies, walking along a fallen tree, so as to reach the fountain. . . . There was also a shower-bath, with no protection except a bower of bushes." Watson must have been a most industrious journal and letter writer. He had great powers of observation and reflection, and a way of jotting down their results marked by an unusual simplicity and vivacity. His life was full of variety and adventure, years of it having been spent abroad; and the list of his personal acquaintance included, among other celebrities, Washington, Franklin, John Adams, Henry Laurens, Drs. Price and Priestley, Tom Paine, (*homo teterrimus*.) Watt, Fulton, Edmund Burke, Copley. With the most distinguished of these gentlemen he was on terms of intimate confidence, as their letters sufficiently witness. It is alike interesting and instructive to trace in these pages the growth of our nation during the more than fourscore years of such a competent chronicler. His mind was constantly active under the spur of a high order of genius for projecting internal improvements, which found a noble field of exercise in the new condition of the country after the Revolutionary War. If he was not *the* father, he was one of them, of the Erie Canal, and of the Agricultural Societies of the North. His "Western" travels in New York, Ohio, and Michigan, show us the infancy of a now stalwart giant. A good moral and religious tone pervades the book. Shrewd prophetic hints are scattered along its pages. Many of them have become happily historical; some of them we read, just now, with anything but happy emotions; as these, written in 1784:

"I pray God, that our recent fabric may never be shattered by the clashing interests of the different States, that the Confederacy will pursue its illustrious career, and that local views will be nobly sacrificed to the common weal. . . . During the external pressure of the common enemy, our temporary government answered all the purposes for which it was organized; but, now that weight is removed, every State may draw into itself, and, like the sensitive-plant, shrink from the representative body of the Union. . . . God only knows what will be the end; but I dread to look forward, from a deep conviction that we cannot long be bound together by the feeble ties which now unite the States. State will soon contend with State; hatred and alienation will ensue; and perhaps the whole continent is destined to be deluged in the mutual slaughter of Americans. . . . And, finally, we shall become a prey to some power of Europe; or some audacious Cromwell will step forth to impose despotic laws, and more than kingly protection."

The old patriot was not so far aside in a part of his predictions. As for the rest, truly "God only knows." But we hardly know a better stimulant to a manly love of our country and to a hearty self-sacrifice for its salvation than this volume, containing the record of two wars for its establishment, furnishes. It will show our enervated people what "hardness as good soldiers" their parents and grandparents endured to found this nation, and so prepare us the more cheerfully to bear the taxation of more than the purse which these present exigencies demand. It might quiet our nerves, as well, amid these clashings of parties which disgrace our current annals, to see the far greater bitterness exhibited, say from 1800 to 1815, among political rivals and their adherents. This tastefully printed volume is made the more valuable by a minute index of thirty double-columned pages.

The Poems of Adelaide A. Proctor. pp. 416. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1863.

A HIGH order of poetical power marks many of these pages. Their prevailing tone is that of a pensive, saddened observation and experience of life. But, while one catches echoes, here and there, of the Hemans school, a healthy vigor rescues these poems from the wearying languor of that lady's verse. Indeed, the strength of this writer is often quite masculine. The struggle against evil goes bravely onward. Submission to only the inevitable is her evident idea of this virtue. She approaches her subject rather through a psychological insight, than by the lights of fancy. There is more of the sculptor than the painter in her work. Among the latter, she would remind us sooner of Ary Scheffer than of Titian, though sometimes her coloring is very brilliant.

None of these pieces are of much length. "A Tomb in Ghent" is full of a subdued, cathedral beauty, shrouded with a thin veil of mystery. "A Legend of Provence" shows bold imagination in the conception, and an exquisite delicacy of finish.

"Did'st thou not know, poor child, *thy place was kept?*"

breathes the true love of God for every broken-hearted penitent. How long must one muse on these lines, also, without exhausting them :

"The hopes that lost in some far distance seem,
May be the truer life, and this the dream."

If humor seldom or never flashes from these verses, there is sharp irony in some of them :

"And the Night cries, 'Sin to be living,'
And the River cries, 'Sin to be dead.'"

* * * *

"For each man knows the market value
Of silk or woollen or cotton . . .
But in counting the riches of England
I think our Poor are forgotten."

"A Legend of Bregenz" trips off with a breezy, ballad-like movement, which finely contrasts with some of these plaintive *suspíria*. "The Wayside Inn" tells over again the old story of youth and joy, of years and sorrow, with a charming simple pathos. "Philip and Mildred" is a sweet and tearful idyll rich in the spoils of womanly love, faith, sacrifice. The young man Philip, become famous and full grown, by a'long, city culture, returns to his native village to wed the maiden of his early fancy, because he had given her his troth. But he was no longer Philip of the 'auld lang syne' :

"What was wanting? He was gentle, kind, and generous still, deferring
To her wishes always; nothing seemed to mar their tranquil life :
There are skies so calm and leaden that we long for storm-winds stirring,
There is peace so cold and bitter, that we almost welcome strife.

"Darker grew the clouds above her, and the slow conviction clearer,
That he gave her home and pity. But that heart and soul and mind
Were beyond her now; he loved her, and in youth he had been near her
But he now had gone far onward, and had left her there behind. ●

"Yes, beyond her : yes, quick-hearted, her Love helped her in revealing
It was worthless, while so mighty : was too weak, although so strong ;
There were courts she could not enter, depths she could not sound ; yet
feeling
It was vain to strive or struggle, vainer still to mourn or long.

"He would give her words of kindness, he would talk of home, but seeming
 With an absent look, forgetting if he held or dropped her hand;
 And then turn with eager pleasure to his writing, reading, dreaming,
 Or to speak of things with others that she could not understand.

"He had paid, and paid most nobly, all he owed; no need of blaming;
 It had cost him something, may be, that no future could restore:
 In her heart of hearts she knew it; Love and Sorrow, not complaining,
 Only suffered all the deeper, only loved him all the more."

This is a most delicate rendering of what is not always an imaginary trouble. It brings at length its own cure; the violets are strewn over her pulseless breast:

"Peace at last. Of peace eternal is her calm, sweet smile a token.
 Has some angel, lingering near her, let a radiant promise fall?
 Has he told her Heaven unites again the links that Earth has broken?
 For on Earth so much is needed, but in Heaven Love is all!"

The short poems entitled "*Maximus*," and "*Optimus*," strike a different key. These stanzas embody nervously a great truth:

"Many, if God should make them kings,
 Might not disgrace the throne He gave;
 How few who could as well fulfil
 The holier office of a slave!

* * * *

"I bow before the noble mind
 That freely some great wrong forgives;
 Yet nobler is the one forgiven,
 Who bears that burden well, and lives.

* * * *

"Glorious it is to wear the crown
 Of a deserved and pure success;
 He who knows how to fail has won
 A crown whose lustre is not less.

* * * *

"Blessèd are those who die for God,
 And earn the Martyr's crown of light;
 Yet he who lives for God may be
 A greater Conqueror in his sight."

"Incompleteness" teaches a pleasant and hopeful philosophy, which we accept, within the obvious limits of the poet's intention. The sense is subtle, expansive, like a choice perfume:

"Nothing resting in its own completeness
 Can have worth or beauty: but alone
 Because it leads and tends to farther sweetness,
 Fuller, higher, deeper than its own."

The thought is variously shaded and reflected ; but this is its lesson :

“ Learn the mystery of Progression duly :
Do not call each glorious change, Decay ;
But know we only hold our treasures truly,
When it seems as if they passed away.”

One of the earliest and best of these minor poems is this hymn of
“ Charity” :

“ Judge not ; the workings of his brain
And of his heart thou canst not see ;
What looks to thy dim eyes a stain,
In God’s pure light may only be
A scar, brought from some well-won field,
Where thou would’st only faint and yield.

“ The look, the air, that frets thy sight,
May be a token, that below
The soul has closed in deadly fight
With some infernal, fiery foe,
Whose glance would scorch thy smiling grace,
And cast thee shuddering on thy face.

“ The fall thou dar’st to despise —
Maybe the angel’s slackened hand
Has suffered it, that he may rise
And take a firmer, surer stand ;
Or, trusting less to earthly things,
May henceforth learn to use his wings.

“ And judge none lost ; but wait and see,
With hopeful pity, not disdain ;
The depth of the abyss may be
The measure of the height of pain
And love and glory that may raise
This soul to God in after days.”

We will transfer to our pages only a single specimen of still another modulation of our author’s song ; “ A Lost Chord ” — the idea and expression of which are alike faultless :

“ Seated one day at the Organ,
I was weary and ill at ease,
And my fingers wandered idly
Over the noisy keys.

“ I do not know what I was playing,
Or what I was dreaming then ;
But I struck one chord of music,
Like the sound of a great Amen.

"It flooded the crimson twilight,
Like the close of an Angel's Psalm,
And it lay on my fevered spirit
With a touch of infinite calm.

"It quieted pain and sorrow,
Like love overcoming strife;
It seemed the harmonious echo
From our discordant life.

"It linked all perplexed meanings
Into one perfect peace,
And trembled away into silence
As if it were loath to cease.

"I have sought, but I seek it vainly,
That one lost chord divine,
That came from the soul of the Organ,
And entered into mine.

"It may be that Death's bright angel
Will speak in that chord again;
It may be that only in Heaven
I shall hear that grand Amen."

These poems furnish our only knowledge of this writer. They discover this fact of her history, that her sympathies, and, we presume, her fellowship, are with the Roman Catholic Church of Great Britain. Not a few of these effusions clothe the religious feeling and sentiment in wholly unexceptionable drapery. We should infer from them a large degree of pure and elevated Christian consecration in their author. We must, however, frankly say, that numerous other pieces are tintured and flavored with genuine and undiluted Mariolatry. The church of which she obviously is a member has reason to be proud of her genius, which we also freely recognize, while totally dissenting from this part of her faith. *We* should not dare to substitute the Mother for the Son in this closing stanza of "The Names of our Lady" (one example out of many):

"*Mary*—our comfort and our hope—
O may that word be given
To be the last we sigh on earth—
The first we breathe in heaven."

The Works of Rufus Choate; with a Memoir of his Life. By
SAMUEL GILMAN BROWN, Professor in Dartmouth College. In

Two Volumes. 8vo. pp. 558 — 523. Boston : Little, Brown & Co. 1862.

THE Greek motto on the title-page, *Ἐν μύρτῳ κλαδί τὸ ξίφος εὐφέρει*, is borrowed, with a justifiable change of tense, from the celebrated ode of Alcæus :

“ ——— pleno resonante plectro,
Exactos tyrannos.”

The swords, concealed in wreaths of myrtle, with which Harmodius and Aristogeiton entered the temple and attacked the Thirty Tyrants, whom they expelled, and thus made all Athenians equal in view of the law, were fit emblems of Choate's strong and keen logic, which reached its aim and did its work all the more effectively, because concealed from common eyes by the splendors of his diction. The choice of this motto shows that, in this respect at least, Professor Brown understood his subject. To understand him fully in all respects, would require a mind not only equal to Choate's in power, but like it in many peculiarities.

There was another and an insuperable difficulty in the way of doing entire justice to Mr. Choate. He never did entire justice to himself. We know not that he deliberately undervalued wealth, or influence, or reputation, contemporary or posthumous ; but no man, perhaps, ever earned so much of them, and yet took so little pains to secure the possession of them. He was always more engrossed in doing justice to the case of some client, or to some interest of his constituents, if in Congress, or to his subject, if addressing a public assembly, than in securing justice to himself. His negligence, both in charging and collecting his fees as a lawyer, is notorious. He was equally negligent in respect to preserving evidence of his ability as an advocate. Cicero, Erskine, Webster, and others, have left copies of their best arguments, carefully prepared by themselves ; but of all the arguments of Choate before courts and juries, the means do not exist for reconstructing even one. And yet in these were the most perfect specimens of his eloquence. We can only know that common fame, and the deliberate testimony of his professional brethren most competent to judge, united in assigning to him the first place among American advocates. Of some of his speeches in Congress, we have the reports made for the Congressional Globe, and revised in proof by himself. Of his addresses before literary societies and on other public occasions, we have, when they have not been lost or stolen, his rough notes, thrown aside as soon as they were delivered, and ever afterwards neglected. So careless was he of posthumous fame as an orator. He has also

left a fragmentary diary, often interrupted and resumed, and containing mostly brief notices for his own use, of his plans and purposes; a few pages of translations from Thucydides and Tacitus, which he would gladly have completed; and a few letters, addressed to his family and friends, and not designed for other eyes.

With such materials, Professor Brown was required to write the Life of Rufus Choate, and edit his works. He has used them, sufficient as they are, faithfully and judiciously. By a skilful use of his materials, he has succeeded in making Mr. Choate, to a considerable extent, his own historian, and thus has given us a better view of his inward life and real character than would have been given in any other way. Of his Speeches, we miss some that we would gladly have seen; but perhaps, like his law arguments, they would not be given. Those that we have contain specimens of eloquence and treasures of wisdom on many subjects, to which we hope to call the attention of our readers at another time; for, as a patriotic statesman, neither Webster nor Burke is more worthy of careful study, as those who study him carefully will acknowledge, even if they dissent from some of his opinions.

It would be injustice to Messrs. Southworth and Hawes not to notice the copy of their well-known photograph of Choate in repose, facing the title-page. It is a good sample of their rare faculty of getting photographs that express something of character.

Praying and Working; being some Account of what Men can do when in earnest. By the Rev. WILLIAM FLEMING STEVENSON. Dublin. 12mo. pp. 411. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1863.

THESE earnest men are John Falk, Immanuel Wichern, Theodore Fliedner, John Evangelist Gossner, Louis Harms. Short biographies concentrate here the spirit and power of their lives — those beautiful, childlike German lives, which seem to us so calm, yet so victorious. How these men go about doing good! and God was and is with them. They mostly had (or still have) to do with reformatory work in the midst of that old and stereotyped civilization of social abuses and religious errors. The "Inner Mission" movement finds here its thrilling record, of which Falk and Wichern may claim the origination. Some of them did faithful missionary service in heathen lands, (the last appears to be doing it yet,) with a self-devotion which merits a narration for the quickening of others to a like zeal. It is difficult for our American minds and hearts to come into full sympathy with those of our Teutonic fellow-disciples. We grasp the same great facts of salvation,

but in a most unlike way of realizing their essential spirit. Nevertheless, we love to read such memorials as these, possibly all the more for this very reason. We are not always sure that we understand the experiences of Christian life exhibited; nor that we should indorse every shade of opinion and feeling presented. But, we commend this volume to our readers, praying that they may imbibe from it, as we would ourselves, a far larger measure of the spiritual blessing which the prophet had in view when he wrote: "In quietness and confidence shall be your strength." What a perfect closing up Gossner's saintly career: "Up to the spring of 1858, he corrected proofs and continued his correspondence. The summer previous, he was still able to train his vines. By the end of March he had fought the good fight, and finished the course — a young old man of eighty-five."

Parish Papers. By NORMAN MACLEOD, D. D. 12mo. pp. 328.
New York: Carter & Brothers. 1863.

"ONE of her Majesty's Chaplains for Scotland" gives us in this volume a series of papers marked by strong and substantial thinking, without any attempt at rhetorical display. Yet they are not heavy or out of accord with the times, as the chapter on "Religious Revivals" fully indicates. "The want of all our wants" (says the respected author) "is this, and this only, a *Revival of Spiritual Religion*; or, in other words, genuine, simple, truthful, honest love to Jesus Christ, to His people, to His cause, and to the whole world." The grave and impressive considerations which he has here placed before the Christian public are well fitted to secure this chief of blessings. The writer takes a close hold upon his subjects, and gives a reason for the faith which is in him. We observe his unflinching maintenance of the doctrine of the Future and Endless Punishment of lost souls, contrary to the mischievous suggestion of Tennyson, which mars his noble "In Memoriam":

"That not one life shall be destroyed,
Or cast as rubbish to the void,
When God hath made the pile complete;"

a question not to be determined by our wishes and feelings, but by the positive words of the Judge himself. This book is worthy a leisurely study.

The Sunday Evening Book: Short Papers for Family Reading.
16mo. pp. 186. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1863.

The Thoughts of God. By the Rev. J. R. MACDUFF, D. D. 16mo. pp. 144. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1863.

AUTHORS and publishers, in these days, seem to be of Goldsmith's mind, that, "if angels were to write books, they never would write folios." These neat little volumes are just large enough for the easiest kind of musing, meditative reading. And if the angels had written them, we were almost going to say that they could not have put within their pages choicer, holier, more nutritious thoughts than are here collected. The *last*, particularly, overflows with the warmest devotional fervors. Its appeals are direct, searching, soothing, inspiring. The *first* is a sheaf of the ripened fruit of such men as Hamilton, Stanley, Eadie, Punshon, Binney, and Macduff. Less impassioned in its style, it conveys rich instruction to the Christian understanding, while it also touches, with a potent wand, the deep places of spiritual emotion.

A Morning beside the Lake of Galilee. By JAMES HAMILTON, D. D., F. L. S. 16mo. pp. 182. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1863.

The Risen Redeemer: The Gospel History from the Resurrection to the Day of Pentecost. By F. W. KRUMMACHER, D. D. 12mo. pp. 298. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1863.

THESE treatises cover the same section of the Life of our Lord upon the earth. No period of that wondrous history is more affluent in topics of tender and jubilant contemplation. Dr. Hamilton charmingly says of it: "Interposed betwixt the Gospels and the Acts, like a beautiful bridge, it leaves no chasm." Nor could its elucidation have fallen into better hands than those of these two gifted and hearty (we mean, heartfull) writers. Each of them excels in that religious sensitiveness, that quick feeling of spiritual beauty, without which it is almost a profanation to touch the personal narrative of Christ. Hardly a living preacher has a more delicate and winning imagination than Hamilton, and it plays around the sacred incidents of these forty days "with the silver flame of a soft, subdued, and subduing light." Krummacher's work is the more labored and complete, taking on, with its practical, spiritual purpose, an attitude of defence against the sceptical critics of this history. These books are a good sample of the successful adaptation of the purest Christian truth to the specific mental characteristics and demands of this age, which will endure anything better than naked intellectuality and dry piety.

Speaking to the Heart; or, Sermons for the People. By THOMAS GUTHRIE, D. D. 12mo. pp. 216. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1863.

DR. GUTHRIE carries this same style of address to a still greater extent. We have questioned its desirableness, for the permanent interests of truth, as thus brought into an almost excessive play. We suppose however, that this exuberance of fancy is natural to him; it certainly so appears to a listener; and we have seen the evidence, in his church crowded to suffocation, that it takes strongly with his Scotch auditory. It is doubtless best for every one to work in his own way, be he the Henry Clay or the Daniel Webster of the pulpit, or one of the immeasurably lesser powers. Looking through these sermons, one can readily see, in their bold, graphic, downright, untrammelled treatment of vital gospel truths, why they would be sure to enchain the attention of any congregation. There is nothing in them roundabout, or ambiguous. What the speaker has to say, he comes at by the shortest roads, and delivers in the most peremptory way. We like this speaking with authority, as a prophet (in the true preaching sense) of the Lord; and if the Doctor is more Oriental than most of his class in these Western realms, he has certainly high example to fall back upon.

Patriarchal Shadows, or Christ and his Church, as exhibited in Passages drawn from the History of Joseph and his Brethren. By OCTAVIUS WINSLOW, D. D. 12mo. pp. 402. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1863.

THE author has struck out a line of ingenious parallelism between the life of Joseph and of Jesus, which may best be given in the titles of some of his chapters; as thus: "The Famished Egyptians sent to Joseph for Bread. Go to Jesus." "The Sacks filled with Corn. A full Christ for empty Sinners." "Joseph making himself known to his Brethren. Christ revealing himself to his people." "Joseph's exaltation in Egypt. The Glory of Christ in heaven." "The Patriarch's Emigration into Egypt. The Christian's Journey." "Joseph Alive. A living Christ the life of the Christian." "Joseph's introduction of his brethren to Pharaoh. Christ's presentation of his church to God." It will at once be felt that the carrying out of such resemblances may tempt the preacher to a forced and strained handling of his material, at many points, while every devout biblical reader has seen the striking correlation of much in the patriarchal narrative with

the attitude and offices of our great "Elder Brother" in human redemption. It would be strange if this danger were here altogether avoided. Though extemporaneously delivered, and printed from a reporter's notes, these lectures afford evidence, in the main, of careful thought and well-balanced doctrinal views. Their expression is often eloquent, always animated. There is more of poetical recitation in them than our severer pulpit taste would approve; we understand that British preaching is much more florid, in this direction, than among ourselves is customary. A very select and (as we think) quite sparing use of poetical embellishment gives impressiveness to certain kinds of pulpit discourse. For popular reading, this series of addresses is excellent. It knows nothing "but Jesus Christ and Him crucified"—the light alike of the "shadows" of the earlier, and of the mid-day of the later, dispensation.

Meditations on Death and Eternity. Translated from the German by FREDERICA ROWAN. 16mo. pp. 414. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1863.

"THE things which are unseen are eternal." A new interest is shed over this intrinsically valuable book, by the information that it aided to prepare the father of a line of British princes for a far more important life than that of earthly royalty, and that it has also been a favorite closet companion of his illustrious wife. It is most pleasant to know that some of those who ride on the high places of the earth are serious-minded Christians. Yet, in the light of such truths as are treated in this volume, all worldly dignities are dwarfed into insignificance. When the veil is withdrawn from the future, God only is great. Zschokke's "*Stunden der Andacht*" (this is its probable authorship) has furnished these "*Meditations*." They are solemn, instructive, quickening. Here and there a shading of doctrine (as in the section '*God is Love*') puts an important truth in a questionable light. The author does not expend himself in giving expression to pious feeling. He lays a strong grasp upon weighty ideas, and out of them brings forth a rich and pure devotional fervor. The stream of consolation flows from the smitten rock. It is good to be alone with thoughts like these. The publishers are laying the religious public under many obligations by issuing, of late, so many of these beautiful aids to a deep and generous spiritual culture.

The Slave Power; its Character, Career, and Probable Designs: being an Attempt to Explain the Real Issues involved in the American

Contest. By J. E. CAIRNES, M. A., Professor of Jurisprudence and Political Economy in Queen's College, Galway, and late Whately Professor of Political Economy in the University of Dublin. 12mo. New York: Carlton. 1862.

The Results of Emancipation. By AUGUSTUS COCHIN, Ex-Maire and Municipal Councillor of Paris. Translated by MARY L. BOOTH (translator of Count de Gasparin's Works on America). 12mo. Boston: Walker, Wise & Co. 1862.

AMONG the multitude of books upon the subject of Slavery which our recent troubles have drawn forth, these have won their way to the confidence of the public as authorities which will repay consultation, being careful in their inductions, philosophical in their methods, good in their temper, and hopeful in their auguries.

"Ministering Children." In Four Volumes; viz: "Ruth and Little Jane"; "Rose, or the Little Comforter"; "Herbert, or True Charity"; and "Patience, or The Sunshine of the Heart." Also, "Tidy's Way to Freedom"; "Trust in God, or Jenny's Trials"; "The Head or the Heart"; "Fire-Light, or Stories for Domesticities"; and "Future Punishment." By JOHN TODD. "The Way to be Happy"; "The Little Knitter"; "The Two Ways." Am. Tract Society, 28 Cornhill, Boston.

THESE volumes are a good addition to our Juvenile Christian literature. They are written in modern style, life-like, earnest, interesting and practical in their bearings toward a better life.

ARTICLE IX.

THE ROUND TABLE.

OUR Table invites us to glean a little, as taste, fancy, or convenience may prompt, from the pages of our contemporaries, which bring to it many good things, and some which might be better. We purpose no formal notice of their contents, (that would be much too formidable a task,) but only a dip into them, here and there, as our reading may wander through their flowery meads or thornier thickets. To begin:

The *Christian Examiner* (March, 1863,) devotes over thirty pages to "The Immortality of the Brute World." The paper is rich in the literature of the topic, gathering opinions and curious surmises concerning this very obscure matter from recondite sources and others more within common reach, ancient and modern. No conclusion is arrived at save a preponderating probability that these lower orders of existence cease to be, at death. It seems, however, that not a few learned men have been inclined to the contrary belief. Passing Plato and the transmigrationists, Leigh Hunt and Theodore Parker saw no reason why "Tomkins's" hounds should not go to heaven as well as the "bumpkin Squire" himself, or why an Abyssinian hyena or a Kentucky rattlesnake should not be as immortal as a Spanish inquisitor or an American kidnapper — that is, if the test is to be found in a mental or moral fitness for that distinction. "Without the supposition of another life, Theodore Parker could not 'vindicate the ways of God to the horse or the ox.' To him the immortality of all animals appeared in harmony with the analogy of nature, rational, benevolent, and beautiful." The Rev. Dr. Hildrop takes the subject up more earnestly, and avers that some animals show a decidedly religious character, that they "would sooner be hanged than pilfer or steal, under the greatest temptation;" and that the Scriptures favor this idea, in saying that dumb beasts are there "said to praise the Lord." The argument is taken from the immateriality of their mental natures to their immortality. Lord Brougham makes the fact of an immaterial spirit the chief ground of its immortal duration; and Hallam can hardly see why the elephant should not be destined to a future state, on this consideration. But that argument is not conclusive. Immateriality is the pledge of immortality *only* as God, the author of it, so wills. Man is immortal not because his soul is immaterial, but because God has made it deathless by his express fiat. He could have made the brute soul equally so, but has he? For if brutes live after death, why, asks Southey's "Doctor," has no one ever seen an animal's ghost? "No cock or hen ghost was ever alarmed by the spirit of its pet lamb; no dog or cat ever came like a shadow to visit the hearth on which it rested while living." Bayle and Hume concluded, from a comparison of the minds of the inferior animals with our own, coupled with the common conviction that the brute perishes at death, that we, also, being no more immaterial in our thinking structure than they, will likewise cease to exist, all alike bearing the stamp of a spiritual as well as physical mortality.

This question has its branches. It does not seem necessary, in order to avoid the analogies thus drawn against human immortality

to go with Des Cartes, Pereira, and Brodie into the theory that all brutal being is merely automatical, without any immaterial soul-life whatever. Nor does Prof. Agassiz satisfy the inquiry by taking sides with the Rev. Dr. Hildrop, and affirming a *quasi* sense of responsibility and consciousness inherent in the higher animals, and that our own heaven will be diminished of its completed joyfulness, if "we may not look to a spiritual concert of the combined worlds, and all their inhabitants, in the presence of their Creator, as the highest conception of Paradise." But here we turn to another of our exchanges —

The *Princeton Review*, (January and April, 1863,) which contains an able and instructive paper on "The True Place of Man in Zoölogy," setting forth the "Excellences" and the "Errors or Defects" of Agassiz's Contributions to the Natural History of our country. We notice but one point. The writer (is he another eminent physicist from abroad?) takes issue with Agassiz on the latter's classification of man with the mammalia, on the basis of certain structural resemblances; out of which identity of family our Cambridge naturalist argues the intellectuality and rationality of the 'higher animals,' and their probable immortality. This, the Princeton reviewer opposes by a denial of any such family relationship, asserting that man, by virtue of his moral nature mainly — his conscience and accountability — and also his gift of articulate speech, is a distinct class of himself, made on a pattern essentially unlike all other living creatures in this world; hence the futility of all this kind of reasoning from him to them, and reversely. The "dog" question, in its religious bearings, is set upon a very orthodox footing. Our distinguished naturalist must make a closer induction of Christian evidences among his canine friends, to save them from being unchurched.

No subject is more arresting just now than "The Scepticism of Science," and, in the January number of the *Princeton Quarterly*, this has found a free and strong handling. The writer looks around for no escape from the authentic results of scientific research; states fairly the nature of its inquiries, and of the authority they carry; is candidly severe upon the tendency to one-sided culture among the scientists; shows no nervous apprehensions concerning the issue of the ordeal through which our Scriptures are passing; but makes one concession to which we must take exception. Physical philosophy pursues the inductive method, rising from particulars to generals. It observes, examines, classifies, and states its discoveries. Religion, on the other hand, has generally pursued the deductive process, fixing the divine authority of its inspired books, and then drawing out of them its doctrines of God, salvation, righteousness. This has been urged to its

detriment, as a false method, by the physicists. We think our essayist yields the point too freely to them. "Theology, as a science, is deductive." "The argumentation of the theological world is predominantly deductive." It may be so. But, *this*, which is here hinted at, is capable of a very strong statement — that, on the purely inductive method, beginning with just what we see every day around us, in man fallen, and nature as it is, we can educe and synthesize the Christian system in its chief elements and components. The philosophers are not entitled, therefore, to rule out the theologians from the field of science as cultivated by the Baconians. This first and noblest of the circle of the sciences has both these methods of prosecuting its investigations equally within reach, and can verify its labors, in either process, by the other. That it does this habitually is very well known to those familiar with its best authorities.

The *Westminster Review* (January) uses "Bishop Colenso" as a war-horse on which to trot out its utter infidelity, with even more than its usual effrontery. It argues, at length, the impossibility of the increase of the Hebrews in Egypt to the numbers stated to have left the land of Pharaoh, but does not prove it; further, that they could not have crossed the Red Sea, nor have lived in the wilderness, as related: (how utterly the efforts of Colenso and Davidson to break down the credibility of the Pentateuch have failed, the latest numbers of the *British Quarterly* and the *North British Review* give ample proof.) It, of course, repudiates all the supernaturalism of the history. Eliminating this, the writer is welcome to his case. But, taking the narrative as it stands, with its miraculous character distinctly marked, his case is worthless. Biblical criticism, which assumes that the supernatural element in the text is falsely there, is a waste of words. It is begging the whole question; for a merely naturalistic Bible is not worth contending about. The reviewer is jubilant at the prospect of the subjection of the rest of the Canon to the same Colensian crucible, in which he foresees an end of its peculiar system of faith; and concludes that we should not be very badly off without any Word of the Lord, to which speedy deprivation we are encouraged to make up our minds, since as good culture has often come out of the Pagan classics as from Hebrew writings; and the savage African is vastly a better Christian than "the Bible-professing traders who come to his shore." We congratulate the bishop upon his eulogists and fellow-helpers. He must feel flattered by his indorsers, and by the ultimatum to which they thus point his labors.

Able as is the "Westminster" on many topics, its vapoing about religion and theology continually makes one think of the man of whom

Montaigne jeeringly writes, "that he quitted the glory of being an excellent physician to gain the repute of a very bad poet"; which is only another turn upon Horace's satirical hit :

"Optat ephippia bos piger, optat arare caballus."

"The lazy ox would saddle have and bit,
The steed a yoke; neither for either fit."

Bluff "Christopher North" has been looking recently through the windows of our neighbors the "Examiner" and the "Atlantic"; with his "Sun-god" face, "buoyant and beautiful, careless, free, elastic, unfading, . . . gentle, earnest, and true, . . . irrepressible, fuming, rampant." Who shall say anything more about adjectives, disrespectfully? for was not glorious *Kit* "exuberant, extravagant, enthusiastic, reckless, stupendous, fantastic"? — this High Admiral of Windermere, this pugilistic Professor of Moral Philosophy; "robust and fine, bulky and sinewy, ponderous and agile, stalwart and elastic." Here is the genesis of the famous "Translation from an Ancient Chaldee Manuscript," which started "Blackwood" on its career of notoriety, involving its publisher in a lawsuit (a first-rate advertisement) on account of its outrageous personalities. Says the "Monthly":

"Hogg, it appears, wrote the first part; Wilson and Lockhart together contributed most of the remainder, amidst side-splitting guffaws, in a session in the house of the Dowager Wilson in Queen Street; while the philosophic Sir William Hamilton, in adding his mite, was so moved by uproarious cachinnation that he fairly tumbled out of his chair."

A CORRESPONDENT sends us the following stanzas written by him to the music which may be found in the close of Mrs. General Fremont's "Story of the Guard."

HYMN.

O LAMB of God, once slain for me,
Thou Crucified, I come to thee,
And on thy blood relying,
Would fain devote that life to thee
Which thou didst purchase on the tree
When dying.

O Lamb of God, thou risen One,
When thou by death hadst won thy throne,
The cross and shame despising;

Didst then in triumph o'er the tomb
Dispel for me the fear and gloom
In rising.

O Lamb of God, ascended Lamb,
Raised to deliver mortal man
From dust and death unending,
Thou led'st the way for me to stand
Complete with thee at God's right hand,
Ascending.

O Lamb of God, enthroned on high,
Thyself before the Father's eye
Forever interceding,
To Mercy's seat, with access nigh,
My daily prayers shall upward fly,
Succeeding.

O Lamb of God, now glorified,
When from thy face thy foes shall hide,
May I, through grace abounding,
Be welcome at thy pierced side —
Redeeming love through heaven wide
Resounding.

ALL'S WELL.

I.

THE day is ended. Ere I sink to sleep
My weary spirit seeks repose in Thine :
Father ! forgive my trespasses, and keep
This little life of mine.

II.

With loving kindness curtain Thou my bed,
And cool in rest my burning pilgrim-feet ;
Thy pardon be the pillow for my head —
So shall my sleep be sweet.

III.

At peace with all the world, dear Lord, and Thee,
No fears my soul's unwavering faith can shake ;
All's well ! whichever side the grave for me
The morning light may break !

K.